fellow members. In short, a union must belong to its members—not to its officials.

2. HONESTY WITHIN UNIONS

Each member must receive full and accurate reports of activities of his union and its officials. The union member is the best watchman over the finances of his own organizations. But he needs the help of the Government in investigating mishandling of union funds and in correcting any wrongdoing.

3. PROTECTION FOR INNOCENT WORKMEN AND SMALL EMPLOYERS FROM COERCIVE PICKETING AND SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Not all picket lines and boycotts are coercive. But some, which are permitted under existing law, clearly injure American workmen in the exercise of their freedom of association and the exercise of their free choice as to dealing collectively. Reasonable compromises can be worked out. The line may not be perfect, but we can show major improvement.

4. ELIMINATION OF CRIMINAL ELEMENTS FROM THE UNION MOVEMENT

This will be accomplished only if we provide simple, practical means of enforcement. The right of union members to the courts should not be curtailed, but the working people of this country and small employers deserve quicker and less expensive methods of securing justice, using the framework of proven means of law enforcement.

5. A FORUM FOR EVERY DISPUTE

The no man's land must be eliminated and, through either State or Federal courts or agencies, there must be a place where labor reform cases can be heard. The same forum need not be used for all cases, but no one subject to the law of the United States should be without a remedy if his fundamental rights have been impaired.

As ranking member of the minority on the House Committee on Education and Labor, I will do everything in my power to see that our committee reports out a bill which will assure the working men and women of this country the fullest protection of their individual freedom. It is not an easy job but one which must—and can—be done.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1959

Rev. Frederick M. Brooks, rector of the Church of the Saviour, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O eternal Lord God, who alone spreadest out the heavens, in an order so precise that man has always been able to look up and know where He is, it is at once complex yet simple, simple and familiar as the dipper in a woman's kitchen or a hunter's belt and horn, grant to us on earth, as You reveal every day new knowledge of Your domain in space, a deeper respect for this order, with its assurance of constancy and continuity.

In this new world of guided missiles, as You reveal this new knowledge, are You speaking to us from Your throne to say: "Mankind must also live in order"?

Are You saying: "I, the Lord God, want guided men as well as guided missiles"?

Are You saying: "Man must work as hard to penetrate the self-barrier as he does the sound barrier"?

Are You telling us, as You reveal the secrets of Your domain, where "the oceans of the future are in the space between the stars," that You are showing us this to save us?

May this, Your order, forever revealing Your greatness and love, speak to the people of the United States in general and especially its Senate.

Grant wisdom to those to whom, in Your name, our people entrust the authority of Government, that justice and peace may be sought, not alone for this country, but for the world.

Remember all who serve this country, at home and abroad; guide them and keep them wherever they may be.

All this we ask in the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 11, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1559) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, June 1859.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2317. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, so as to provide for the bonding of persons licensed to engage in a business, trade, profession, or calling involving the collection of money for others;

H.R. 2318. An act to provide for the regulation of closing-out and fire sales in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 2322. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other taxes;

H.R. 4072. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended;

H.R. 4454. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by not more than 15 trustees; and

H.R. 7040. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2317. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, so as to provide for the bonding of persons licensed to engage in a business, trade, profession, or calling involving the collection of money for others;

H.R. 2318. An act to provide for the regulation of closing-out and fire sales in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 2322. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other taxes;

H.R. 4072. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended; and

H.R. 4454. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by not more than 15 trustees; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7040. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1959—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 140)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is at the desk a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, which I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate. I ask that the message be not read, because it is now being read in the House of Representatives, but that it be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to notify the Senate that the time between now and 10 minutes after 12 will be used only for the introduction of bills and other measures, after which a quorum will be called.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental or research work, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an audit of that fund, for the year ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF BOARD FOR FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION

A letter from Ross, McCord, Ice & Miller, Indianapolis, Ind., transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit and annual reports of the Board for Fundamental Education, for the year 1958 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conferences at Geneva, May 1958 and June 24, 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I present a resolution memorializing Congress to work for the passage of a U.S. constitutional amendment denying any State an unfair process of taxation adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island at the January session 1959, and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 550

Resolution memorializing Congress to work for the passage of a U.S. constitutional amendment denying any State an unfair process of taxation

Whereas it has ever been the unending crusade of the citizens of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to uphold the freedom of the individual from unjust acts; and

Whereas said State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations has never sought to take advantage of the citizens of neighboring States that are employed within the border of this State by dual taxation on earnings; and

Whereas a Commonwealth which having built its history upon the premise of war against unfair taxation, dating back to Revolutionary days now does seek to extract from wage earners of other States an unjust tax without representation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the general assembly now memorialize Congress to work for the passage of a U.S. constitutional amendment denying any State this unfair process of taxation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States asking each to give immediate attention to the need for such a U.S. constitutional amendment and to work for its passage.

AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I present a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the passage of bill, S. 925, dealing with the Immigration and Nationality Act and adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island at the January session, 1959, and request it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1433

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the passage of bill, S. 925, dealing with the Immigration and Nationality Act (McCarran-Walter law)

Whereas Senate bill 925 has been introduced in the Senate of the United States which would grant nonquota status to certain immigrants who are brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of U.S. citizens;

Whereas efforts have been exerted for many years by the American Committee on Italian Migration—member agency of the National Catholic Resettlement Council—for legislation to help resolve the urgent and pressing problem of the fourth preference quota on the grounds that it is unfair to permit U.S. citizens to file petitions for their brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters, granting them approval, and then letting them pile up in huge backlogs at the American consulates abroad approved without the hope of any visas being issued. Fourth preference visas can be issued only when deficiencies occur in the first, second, or third preferences, which are alloted 100 percent of the quota—a rare and unlikely occurrence especially in countries with low quota numbers.

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States pass Senate bill 925; directing the secretary of state to transmit a duly certified copy of this to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses in the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress.

AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

U.S. FORESTRY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution in support of the U.S. forestry program, as adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Itasca County, Minn., on May 5, be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 5-59-12

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has submitted to the U.S. Congress a program for the national forests which sets forth long-range objectives for development and use of the forests and for research work which will be of benefit to all forestry programs; and

Whereas a substantial part of the Chippewa National Forest is located in Itasca County and the improvement of roads, recreation facilities, fire protection and the increased planting and harvesting of timber is important to the people of Itasca County; and

Whereas the research program of the U.S. Forest Service is important in providing information for the management of county-owned lands as well as other lands used for forestry purposes and which are a vital part of the economy of the entire northern Minnesota area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Board of Commissioners of Itasca County, Minn., does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the program for national forests as outlined by the Secretary of Agriculture and take the appropriate action to implement the program; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman H. D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and to the Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota.

PLIGHT OF TIBETAN PEOPLE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies of the Diocese of Rockville Centre, Long Island, N.Y., expressing sympathy for the plight of the Tibetan people.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on May 23, 1951, the Chinese Communist government signed an agreement to preserve the political and religious autonomy of the Tibetan people; and

Whereas the Tibet local government under its head, the Dalai Lama, has recently been ordered dissolved by the Chinese Communist government; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist government has barbarously intervened to deprive the Tibetan people of their political and religious autonomy; and

Whereas the United States has long been urged by some factions to grant diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist government, and to support its request for admission to the United Nations, on the basis that the Chinese Communists were different from the Russian Communists, and were only agrarian reformers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies of the Diocese of Rockville Centre, That we express our sympathy for the plight of the Tibetan people; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the U.S. Government to continue its policy of not granting diplomatic recognition to Communist China and of not supporting its request for admission to the United Nations.

HEMPSTEAD, N.Y., *May 3, 1959*.

RESOLUTION OF DAIRY FARMERS OF AMERICA, INC., SELKIRK, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Dairy Farmers of America, Inc., of Selkirk, N.Y., relating to farm prices.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE DAIRY FARMERS OF AMERICA, INC., SELKIRK, N.Y.

Whereas the Department of Agriculture recently stated that the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar in 1958 amounted to 40 cents, compared with the 53 cents received in 1946;

Whereas the Department also stated that present indications are the farmer will receive less of the food dollar in 1959 than in 1958;

Whereas the present farm program has failed to increase farmers' income; and

Whereas the Congress needs to take action to improve farm income: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Onondaga County Dairy Farmers of America in session this 5th day of May request the Congress to pass legislation to encourage an upward trend in farm prices; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to you, Senator KENNETH KEATING, and Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.

Respectfully yours,

WALLACE GREVELDING, *President*.
JOHN SUTTER, *Secretary*.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY KING BAUDOUIN OF THE BELGIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the previous order the Senate will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., pursuant to the order entered yesterday, the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the address to be delivered by King Baudouin of the Belgians.

(For the address delivered by the King of the Belgians, see p. 8007 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

COMMENT ON ADDRESS TO CONGRESS BY BAUDOUIN, KING OF THE BELGIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened to many memorable addresses delivered before joint sessions of the U.S. Congress. I have listened with great attention to such persons as Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill, Madam Chiang Kai-shek, Prime Minister Clement Attlee, and others.

But I think the speech delivered today by the King of the Belgians, with its emphasis on peace, youth, and better understanding, is one of the outstanding messages ever delivered to a joint session of the U.S. Congress. The point he made that it takes 20 years to make a man and only 20 seconds to destroy him is one worth taking to our hearts.

Mr. President, King Baudouin has honored us with a great speech and we are grateful to him for the sentiments expressed. He represented his country, his person, and his ideals in a way which will cement Belgian-American relations and make for a better understanding between us. The Senate wishes the King and his country well.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to endorse the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] with respect to the magnificent address which was delivered at the joint meeting of Congress by the King of the Belgians.

It was one of the finest addresses, if not the finest, by the head of a foreign government, which we have been privileged to hear at a joint meeting of Congress. The sincerity with which it was delivered touched the hearts of everyone who was privileged to hear it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I echo the sentiments which have been expressed with reference to the masterful and brilliant address delivered by the King of the Belgians at the joint meeting of Congress. Seldom have we been privileged to hear such emphasis, in such a profound, philosophical way, on two themes which His Majesty dwelled on particularly, peace and youth. He could not have chosen any other subject on which he would find such great and enthusiastic response from everyone in this country.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join with the Senators who have commended to the Senate and to the country the address delivered today at the joint meeting of Congress by the King of the Belgians. It was a great address in many respects, moving and philosophical.

We are preoccupied, as is natural and necessary with our difficulties with Soviet Russia and with the conflict between the democratic and the Communist worlds. We are concerned, and properly so, with our military strength to assure our security. We also concern ourselves with many economic measures to assist other countries, because it is right to do so, and to maintain a democratic balance of power in the world.

Nevertheless we forget at times a great source of unity between the democratic and non-Communist countries, which the King of the Belgians brought to our minds today. It is this:

The democratic and non-Communist countries, in their most essential sense, differ from the Communist countries in that our systems are derived from spiritual sources. The Communist world rejects this fundamental thesis—it rejects any Supreme Being, and our concept that man's proudest freedoms are derived from spiritual law. It is a point of unity which we forget and which we neglect. It is a great source of spiritual power between the non-Communist countries which we ought to understand and which could move many peoples throughout the world. The King recognized this in his speech. It was a profound address, philosophically and spiritually—and because it was, it moved all of those who heard it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of Congress who was privileged to hear the address delivered by the King of the Belgians was deeply moved and greatly impressed not only by the eloquence of the address but by the profoundness of its philosophy, and the meaning of the words expressed.

Mr. President, I found the address most remarkable for two reasons. First of all, it was a completely affirmative and constructive message which laid before the Congress of the United States and the American people an attitude of mind and spirit which I think it would be well for us to emulate.

The King, in his remarks, did not resort to an appeal to negative qualities, or even to an attack upon those who threaten the peace of the world. Rather, he appealed to man's sense of decency and justice, and he urged upon us the realization of our responsibilities as a great power and as a great people.

Secondly, Mr. President, I was impressed by the emphasis in the message upon peace and youth. I shall long remember what the King had to say, and I can only paraphrase it, and most inadequately: It takes 20 years to make a young man, but only 20 seconds to destroy his life. That analogy will be remembered by the listeners of the address and by the public in general for years to come. It tells us in a few short words the many difficulties a nation has in building the peace; the careful, constructive, creative work which must go into building conditions that are conducive to peace It also tells us what mankind has been able to perfect in terms of destruction, which can lead to catastrophe.

The emphasis upon youth in a nation of young was most appropriate. I trust we may support the idealism which that phrase reveals, and that the faith and courage which are so typical of youth will stand us well in the years to come.

I wish to thank the Belgian people for giving us the privilege of hearing their King. I wish to associate myself with the comments of my colleagues in praise, not only of the man and the office he

holds, but of the message and the ideals and hopes expressed in it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing my thanks to the King of the Belgians for the great message he delivered to the Congress of the United States. It was a message not alone to the Congress and to the people of the United States; it was a message to the people of the world. Of the many great truths he spoke, I thought his definition of peace as the tranquillity of order had imbedded in it a message to the leaders of all the nations, because, after all, what must be sought and accomplished is an order through justice, to which the King referred.

As one Member of this body, I thank the people of Belgium for sending to us such an able leader with such a great message.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate respecting the address delivered by the King of the Belgians to Congress today. I also wish to make two points, to which I should like to invite the special attention of my colleagues. The first point is that the very person of this young man, who spoke so optimistically of youth, typified youth. It is very heartening to us to see a youth in such a position of responsibility and in full command of the ideals of youth. Secondly, and very importantly, the King spoke of democratic ideals. Yet he is a king. I think that fact demonstrates what is happening in the modern world, all to the good, so far as we are concerned.

Next, the King spoke of self-determination, which he sees as something in prospect for the peoples whose fortunes are now so heavily the responsibilities of the Belgians. I refer to people in Africa. We see the modern concept of trusteeship and stewardship by people in a more advanced degree of industrialization in behalf of less fortunate people, so they can soon conduct their own affairs and fully participate in all important matters which need to be decided in the world.

So I wish to join my colleagues, first, in thanking the people of Belgium for sending us their King. Secondly, I wish to thank the people of Belgium for their free institutions, as depicted in their ideals, so that on this day in 1959 a king can be speaking his own mind and also the minds of his own people.

FURTHER MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Morning business is still in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 1887. A bill for the relief of Alice V. Tenly (Rept. No. 282).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment.

H.R 4597. An act to provide for the training of postmasters under the Government Employees Training Act (Rept. No. 283); and

H.R. 4599. An act to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 284).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 685. A bill to exempt from all taxation certain property of the Association for Childhood Education International in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 285); and

S. 1370. A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (Rept. No. 286).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1159. A bill to facilitate the acquisition of real property under the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act (Rept. No. 287); and

H.R. 4282. An act to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 288).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 866. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1910 (Rept. No. 289).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and thirty-four postmaster nominations.

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

David Brewer Karrick, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1916. A bill to establish a Central Security Office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1917. A bill for the relief of Artemis Toskos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1918. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1919. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1920. A bill relating to mining claims on lands within the national forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1921. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Spanish War Veterans, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1922. A bill providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK (for himself and Senators HUMPHREY, JAVITS, O'MAHONEY, BARTLETT, CARROLL, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, JACKSON, MCCARTHY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, SYMINGTON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 118) to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate with regard to the selection of the Senate members of committees of conference, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Central Security Office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes.

The bill carries out the principal recommendations of the Commission on Government Security, the 12-member bipartisan group set up by Congress to conduct a thorough review of all our loyalty and security programs. The junior Senator from Mississippi and I represented the Senate on that Commission.

We are presenting this proposed legislation, as we did last year, to make sure the recommendations of the Commission are formally before the Congress in bill form. I believe they furnish a good pattern from which to work in establishing an effective, consistent, and fair loyalty and security program for Federal employees, though I am not suggesting they should be adopted without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

The work of the Commission clearly demonstrated the need for a full overhauling of our present loyalty-security

programs which rest on the confusing and even conflicting philosophies expressed in a 1950 law, a 1953 Executive order, and a 1956 decision of the Supreme Court.

I believe the time has come for the enactment of legislation to put the program on a sound, permanent basis, with adequate safeguards for the rights of every individual affected, and I hope the subject will receive early attention by the appropriate Senate committee.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I submitted on this subject to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1916) to establish a Central Security Office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. STENNIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. COTTON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR NORRIS COTTON, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE GOVERNMENT SECURITY PROGRAM TO NONSENSITIVE POSITIONS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity you have accorded me, in view of my service as a member of the Commission on Government Security, to express my views on proposed legislation dealing with the loyalty security programs for Federal employees.

I believe the time is ripe for the long delayed, top to bottom overhauling of the Government's loyalty security systems.

The Federal employee security program grew up like Topsy during World War II and the decade which followed. Vigorous efforts on the part of the administration have produced some gains in coordinating the various programs (there are some seven different loyalty security programs), eliminating abuses, and closing the loopholes. Nevertheless, the fact remains our present personnel security programs are based on the rather conflicting philosophies of 1950 legislation, a 1953 Executive order and a 1956 Supreme Court decision.

An overhauling is sorely needed. Demands for it have echoed and re-echoed in Congress for many years. Congress clearly, and unanimously, expressed the need for it in 1955 when the Commission on Government Security was established and charged with laying the groundwork for a thoroughgoing revision.

A great public service can be performed by consideration and enactment of a new statutory basis for the whole loyalty security program.

I am convinced this is the opportune time for such an achievement. The heat of controversy which so long engulfed the security programs has now largely dissipated. The emotional basis which colored so much of the discussion of the past is gone. Congress, and this committee, can approach the task now with a dispassionate calmness which would have been impossible a few years ago.

Furthermore, new tools are at hand. The Commission on Government Security has completed its work. Its 800-page report has been available for almost 2 years. Ample time has passed for review and consideration of its recommendations. Numerous other public and private agencies have completed their own studies of the loyalty-security problem and offered their recommendations.

Furthermore, mere stop-gap legislation to deal with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cole case is no longer adequate, in my opinion. Three years have elapsed since that decision and the time for emergency action by the Congress has long since passed. Legislation should meet the long-term need.

This committee, under the guidance of both Mr. MURRAY and Mr. REES, has a long record of leadership in the field of Federal employee legislation. I hope the committee will seize this opportunity to enact new, permanent legislation which will set the loyalty-security program to rights. I urge it to do so.

I urge this course because a vigorous and effective security program is imperative to our national security and survival.

My convictions in this matter were reinforced by my service on the Commission on Government Security. The first conclusion which the Commission reached concerned the inescapable necessity for a loyalty-security program. We are naturally reluctant to inquire into the beliefs and allegiances of our fellow citizens, but the world we live in has robbed us of any choice. It is fact that the Communist still aims its weapons of infiltration, deception, and subversion against our Nation, probing unceasingly for the weak links in the chain of American security. Modern technology has only heightened the dangers and increased the needs. Dangers which were formerly days or weeks away are now only minutes away. Only a positive requirement for loyalty to the ideals and aspirations which are shared by all devoted Americans can suffice.

A loyalty-security program for Federal employees and others in sensitive positions is unpleasant, but absolutely unavoidable necessity. Nevertheless, it need not be an undue burden on our sense of freedom, justice, or fair play. I believe the recommendations of the Commission on Government Security pointed the way to an effective and realistic program of security which grants full recognition to the rights of individuals. In fact, I regard adequate safeguards for the rights of individuals as a vital means of strengthening the security program. Public confidence and individual confidence in the fairness of the system is essential to its operation.

The first principle which must govern our program is a consistent, all-inclusive requirement of loyalty. There is no room in the Federal service for the disloyal citizen. The American people are entitled to full assurance that their public servants are loyal and worthy of trust. This requirement for loyalty must be applied to every Federal employee and every applicant for employment, whether his work will involve vital defense secrets or the most menial and commonplace tasks. The Commission on Government Security has suggested a specific standard of loyalty and recommended rather detailed criteria for applying that standard and I commend them to you.

To brand any American as disloyal carries the gravest consequences. To inflict such a brand upon a patriotic citizen would be tragic. Therefore, I believe the most careful and comprehensive safeguards must surround every loyalty proceeding. No person should be excluded from Federal employment on loyalty grounds without every fair chance to meet the charge. A full hearing should be accorded, accompanied by a right of appeal and a number of procedural safeguards, including, I believe, a right of subpena and the right to confront the witnesses, restricted only by the most impelling considerations of national security.

Even though he may be loyal beyond question, an employee may constitute a threat to national security because of background or character defects. A man who simply talks too much may unintentionally reveal important secrets. The sex pervert or the alcoholic may be subjected to pressure to aid the Communist conspiracy. Such a person should not occupy a position which provides even the slightest opportunity to damage the national interest. But, at the same time, he must not bear the stigma of disloyalty. I believe such persons should be dealt with under the time-tested suitability procedures established by the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912. For 46 years the act has provided a satisfactory and fair basis for excluding persons from Federal employment for the efficiency of the service. These procedures can be easily adapted to meet the additional requirements of national security. They offer the best means of treating this problem. I am heartened by the Committee's approval of this approach in its action on S. 1411 in the last Congress.

May I say in conclusion that I am not suggesting that the report of our Commission on Government Security, even though it was the result of long and careful consideration by members of Congress and representative citizens with the aid of an exceptionally able staff, necessarily contains all the solutions or that it should be adopted without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t". I do assert that it sets up a real standard and furnishes a good pattern from which to work.

I am positive, however, that a sound legislative foundation in this field is a pressing need.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the 84th Congress we passed legislation amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was then aware of the fact that if tax benefits were added to the benefits under the bill providing for the amendment, as written, it would be possible for some large corporate claimants to receive more in total benefits than was actually lost abroad. At the same time, some of the smaller claimants would not receive anywhere near the amount of money that they lost in foreign countries. To correct this patently unfair and unsought for effect, the Senate Committee adopted an amendment which I offered. The Senate accepted the amendment and it went with the bill to conference.

During our meetings, the conference committee, of which I was a member, was informed by representatives of the Internal Revenue Service that the Senate's interpretation of the bill as it related to existing tax law was inaccurate. On the strength of that information, the conference committee agreed to drop the Senate amendment.

Subsequent to the enactment of the law, I engaged in further consultation with the Treasury Department. In the course of this consultation, the Department furnished me with a memorandum on the law which in effect proved that the Senate had been correct and that the representatives of the Internal Revenue Service had been wrong. I therefore urged that a new bill be prepared

to correct the defect in the present legislation. Such a bill was prepared with the cooperation of the Treasury Department and the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I introduced it in the 85th Congress as S. 979.

My bill provided for the reduction of any awards made under title III of the act, by an amount equal to any tax benefits which a claimant may have obtained from writing off the loss upon which the award is based, except that no award would be reduced on that account to less than $5,000.

In favorably reporting my bill to the Senate the Committee on Foreign Relations stated in its report that the bill "will correct a serious injustice in the provisions of Public Law 285, and that it will insure a more equitable distribution of the funds available to deserving claimants"—Senate Report No. 612, 85th Congress.

S. 979 was passed by the Senate on August 5, 1957, but the House of Representatives took no action on it.

Recent statements by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission have confirmed the doubts which I expressed almost 4 years ago. It appears, for example, that the Hungarian claims fund will have in it about $3 million and that the awards against it will exceed $45 million. Claimants without tax benefits will, therefore, be compensated to the extent of no more than 7 percent. Claimants who were able to obtain tax benefits will be able to reduce their losses by a substantially higher percentage and, in some cases, even register windfall gains.

I do not think we should close our eyes to the tax benefits which claimants may have received, and pay the same 7 percent to the man who has never been able to cut down his loss as well as to the man who has reduced his loss by more than 90 percent.

Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference another bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. I believe that this bill will remedy the inequity which has already been demonstrated. Also it will prevent claimants who were able to obtain tax benefits from having windfall gains. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1918) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1959—WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which I call the World Refugee Year immigration bill.

Mr. President, as to the participation of my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] as a cosponsor of this measure, I wish to make the following statement. The junior Senator from New York is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and of its Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. Hence, while joining in the introduction of the bill, because of his interest in the general objective of a constructive revision of the immigration laws, and his interest in an effective provision for refugee-escapee admissions to the United States, especially those from behind the Iron Curtain, the junior Senator from New York reserves his judgment and freedom of action as to the detailed provisions of the bill.

This World Refugee Year immigration bill seeks to modernize the present Immigration and Nationality Act and to make provision for the admission annually of about 60,000 refugee-escapees fleeing racial, religious or political persecution by Communists or others opposed to the free world; 40,000 refugee-escapees specially would be admitted over a 2-year period beginning July 1, 1959, the date marking the official start of World Refugee Year.

Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York is introducing a similar bill in the other body.

During World Refugee Year 59 United Nations members, including the United States, have pledged themselves to focus attention on the refugees, seek additional financial aid and help develop a permanent solution of the world refugee problem which encompasses the fate of over 2 million persons.

The immigration legislation we are introducing would give the President the authority to admit a maximum of 60,000 refugee-escapees per annum on parole in the event of an emergency situation; they would be eligible to apply for permanent residence 2 years after their entry into the United States under this program. This is substantially the administration's recommendation of a few years ago. We must not be caught unprepared again as to refugee-escapees as we were at the time of the Hungarian revolt. In addition, this legislation would permit "pooling" of unused quotas left over from any previous year; also it would update the quota system by basing it on 1950 instead of 1920 census figures.

Also, it would eliminate various procedural injustices in the administration of the present law, speed up the admission of immigrants who are related to U.S. citizens and thus eligible to apply under the fourth preference category; and provide for the issuance of a total of 5,000 special nonquota immigrant visas under the refugee-escapee section to unresettled, so-called hard core cases.

The recent announcement by Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, that very shortly the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings for the first time in more than 3 years on major bills including vitally important amendments to the often discriminatory current Immigration Act—Public Law 414—has long been awaited. For some years now, attempts by many of us to get consideration of amendments to the immigration law on the Senate floor have met the threat that our efforts would result in the defeat of miscellaneous, minor but deserving immigration bills like last year's Azores refugee bill.

At long last, a national awareness on the part of our people which is attributable in large part to work of many private groups like the Zellerbach Commission of the International Refugee Committee, the U.S. Committee on Refugees and others is stimulating immigration law revisions. The United States has a moral responsibility to its own citizens as well as to the anti-Communist struggle to assume its fair share of the homeless, often hopeless refugee-escapees of Communist and other totalitarian forces within the broad framework of a modern, humane immigration law. Today, our immigration regulations appear to stand as a barrier before the very eyes of those who have risked all in a gesture of faith in U.S. peace leadership.

Bipartisan efforts in 1957 and 1958 in the Senate to serve the national interest and to carry out the pledges in both the Republican and Democratic national platforms of 1956 by enacting fundamental revisions in the immigration law were constantly frustrated. Then in late August of last year, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee gave assurances in a colloquy on the floor of the Senate that the Immigration Subcommittee would finally explore four key issues—the national quota system, resettlement of Iron Curtain refugees, speeding up admissions of refugee-escapees under Public Law 84–316, and action on the enormous backlog of persons awaiting entry under the "fourth preference." I hope that every provision in the comprehensive immigration bill we are submitting today to do this will receive the closest study by the subcommittee and the expert witnesses who will testify before it.

A major provision of today's bill calls for the admittance annually of a maximum of 60,000 refugee-escapees with an additional 40,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to be available from July 1, 1959, through June 30, 1961, for the pool of refugee-escapees awaiting help. The pathetic procession of the dispossessed which began from Nazi Germany in the 1930's has swelled to such tragic proportions since World War II that no area in the free world can remain immune to the desperate predicament of refugee-escapees.

It is reported that the free nations in Asia are flooded with more than 1 million refugees from the Chinese mainland and now escapees from courageous Tibet are joining their ranks as they flee the Red Chinese. In North Africa, 170,000 Algerian refugees live in the most primitive conditions. In the Mideast, Israel has resettled 900,000 Jewish refugees while little progress has been made in resettling the 600,000 to 700,000 Arab refugees. Nonresettled European refugees, thousands from behind the Iron

Curtain, total an estimated 175,000 with another 25,000 anticipated in the next 2 years.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has taken slightly less than 25 percent of those European refugees who have been resettled compared to nearly 50 percent absorbed by European nations. Under the terms of the bill we are now proposing, the United States could issue visas during a 2-year period to 40,000 or about 23 percent of the nonresettled refugees in Europe alone, which if they are issued at the rate of about 20,000 a year would approximate the recommendations of both the Zellerbach Commission and the U.S. Committee on Refugees. Five thousand of these could be issued to hard core, unresettled refugee-escapees.

The bill's provision of $5 million in grants to public and private agencies to bear the cost of resettling and rehabilitating 5,000 so-called hard core cases is as small as this because of the experience of other nations. Austria, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, and West Germany, for example, have found that the majority of these refugees can become self-supporting. Even if they cannot, frequently, they are members of a family group which has remained behind with them in a camp to avoid separation. Following their own resettlement, these families could provide adequate care for such relatives unable to care fo themselves. The U.S. share under this section would absorb about one-tenth of the hard core cases still in European camps today.

By establishing 1950 as the base year for the national origins quota system instead of 1920, the present law would recognize that the U.S. population has increased by 40 percent or some 45 million people, during those three decades. Then although the regular immigration quota for any one of these named countries would still not exceed 12,000 annually, the allotment for Italy would increase 99 percent, for Hungary 93 percent, for Greece 116 percent, and for Austria 136 percent. No provision under our existing law has drawn heavier, more justified criticism from our friends abroad as unjust, inequitable, and hopelessly archaic than has the present state of the national origins quota system. This change is the most urgently needed revision in existing law contained in my bill.

Title IV of the bill would facilitate the entry of an estimated 85,000 individuals, principally from Italy and Greece who are eligible for entry under the "fourth preference" provision—they have reached 21 or are married and are the sons or daughters, brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens.

Those whose admission was already approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, would now be eligible to enter without reference to the quota for their native land, thus speeding up the admission of those who have become eligible for entry since that date by cutting sharply the waiting period.

Title I of the proposed legislation eliminates the second-class citizenship provisions in the present law which forces naturalized citizens to surrender their citizenship if they reside abroad indefinitely. Another amendment in the same title ends the racial test for those of half-Asiatic origin seeking to immigrate and allows Asiatic and colonial peoples to come in under the quota for their native country.

No greater service could be performed in the name of justice, humanity, and our own national self-interest than that as a result of the scheduled hearings on major immigration bills such as this one, the facts on our immigration policies and their importance to our position in the struggle for peace shall become clear to every one of us. And no fundamental revision of our existing laws would be complete without a refugee-escapee provision which indicates by its very adequacy that we realize the United States must help the free world to offer those brave enough to escape an attractive alternative to communism and all forms of totalitarianism. We must be prepared to make attainable reality to those now trapped behind the Iron Curtain the prospect of some day living in freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a section analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1919) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The section analysis presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT—PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONGRESS)

The short title of the bill is "Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1959."

TITLE I

Section 101: Amends sections 212(a)(15) and 241(a)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212(a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental process the probability of future proscribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287(a)(1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353 and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. Repeals section 350 of Public Law 414, which provides for divestiture of nationality in the case of dual nationality of natural-born Americans. Repeals section 355 of Public Law 414, which deals with loss of American nationality through the expatriation of a parent.

Section 105: Amends sections 101(2)(37), 212(a)(28)(D), 241(a)(6)(D), and 313(a)(3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244(a)(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Section 107: Amends section 201(e) of Public Law 414, eliminating provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 108: By amending sections 202(a)(5) and 202(e) and repealing section 202 (b), (c), and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota area. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

TITLE II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101(a)(6) of Public Law 414, restored preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose).

Section 202: By amending section 212(9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212(c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204: Repeals section 235(c) of Public Law 414 which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241(d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206: Amends section 245 of Public Law 414 which permits the Attorney General to adjust the status of an alien temporarily here to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The amendment softens the unnecessarily rigorous requirements which an alien now must meet.

Section 207:

(a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 208: Repeals section 360(a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 209: Amends section 260(c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by the Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360(b).

Section 210: Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

TITLE III

Section 301: Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists of quotas 12,000 and under (includes Italian, Creek, Dutch, Austrian, and Eastern European quotas). Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

TITLE IV

Section 401: Amends Public Law 85-316. Petitions for admission by fourth preference quota immigrants which were approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, will be admitted to the United States without reference to quota. For those filing petitions subsequent to July 1, 1957, therefore, the waiting time for admittance would be greatly diminished.

TITLE V

Section 501: Empowers the President to direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees, selected by the Secretary of State, who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, have fled or shall flee from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area or from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world and free institutions are at work, and who cannot return on account of race, religion, or political opinion. Limits the number of such refugee-escapees to the average number of aliens authorized to be admitted to the United States for permanent residence each fiscal year since June 25, 1948, by any special acts of Congress enacted on or after that date; this would set a maximum limit under this section of approximately 60,000 annually. Sets up a procedure whereby the immigration status of parolees may be adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident by permitting the Attorney General to grant such adjustment in his discretion after the alien has been in the United States for 2 years and if the applicant is of good character, and if the adjustment would not be contrary to the national interest. Requires a report of such adjustment to be submitted to the Congress and if Congress does not register disapproval then the alien's entry would be recorded as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. Limits the number of aliens whose status may be adjusted in any one fiscal year to the average number of aliens authorized to be admitted to the United States for permanent residence each fiscal year since June 25, 1948, unless otherwise specified by congressional resolution.

Section 502: Authorizes the issuance of 40,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to refugee-escapees for the period July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1961, of which 5,000 may be unresettled hard core refugees. This is pointed to the reservoir of refugees presently awaiting settlement.

Section 503: Refugee-escapees under section 502 to be admitted only if eligible under the Immigration and Nationality Act except for unresettled hard core refugees.

Section 504: Special nonquota immigrant visas authorized in section 502 shall be issued in accordance with section 221 ("Issuance of Visas") of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except for unresettled hard core refugees.

Section 505: Authorizes $5 million in grants to U.S. public or private agencies for resettlement in the United States of unresettled hard core refugees admitted under section 502.

Section 506: Definitions.

Section 507: Authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out provisions of this title.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL TIMBER ON LANDS INVOLVING MINING CLAIMS OR PATENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would make applicable to all national forests those laws which are now in effect in the case of certain individual national forests such as the Mount Hood Forest of Oregon, in order to prevent the free and automatic conveyance of surface resources when a mining patent is granted on these public lands.

I am joined in sponsoring this proposed legislation by my colleagues, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I ask unanimous consent that a short statement which I have prepared regarding my proposal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1920) relating to mining claims on lands within the national forests, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

The bill which I introduce today is similar to a measure which I presented in the last Congress. It is designed to correct a loophole in existing law on the subject of management for multiple use of the surface resources of public lands on which mining claims are awarded.

At the present time Federal law gives to a successful locator of minerals on Federal public lands a fee-simple patent to the land in question—without regard to its surface resources which may have nothing to do with minerals or mining. This fact is of particular importance in our national forests where management of timber, recreation, and watershed activities requires regulation and control as a single unit. Congress has recognized such significance in a series of acts passed over the past 25 years by which a number of national forests have been removed from the scope of the laws under which mining patents convey title to surface as well as minerals.

The provisions of this bill leave ample opportunity for all legitimate mining operations. Persons who locate mineral deposits on national forest land may occupy and use the surface to the extent necessary to carry on prospecting and developmental work. Timber may be cut and used for actual mining operations. If a claim is patentable under the mining laws, a patent will still issue. But it conveys only title to the mineral deposits within the claim and the right to use the surface and timber to the extent essential to actual mining. Title to the surface remains with the United States. The timber belongs to our Government.

Thus, subject to the full privileges necessary for actual mining operations, the U.S. Forest Service would retain control over surface resources and surface management for all the other multiple purposes of the national forests. Yet it would be difficult to claim that mining activities were not fully protected and given every opportunity to succeed. And, provided, that legitimate mining operations are given all the rights and privileges necessary for carrying on actual mining operations, I do not see how any direct defense can be offered for giving to mineral patentees, along within the minerals they have located, valuable timber stands and other important resources and surface rights necessary for conservation and multiple-use policies in our national forests.

It is bad enough that, under present law, the United States has to convey with a mining patent a fee-simple title that goes beyond the actual needs of even a sound, legitimate mining operation, and conveys timber, other resources and control permanently beyond the policies of the Forest Service. But implicit in this situation is, of course, the much more outrageous result that such a complete title to national forest land may be conveyed—land and trees worth many thousands of dollars and perhaps very important to some Forest Service objective or policy—and then no mining may actually be carried on for years, or even ever. These patents, once legally granted, are not accompanied by any condition subsequent which would cause the land to revert to the United States unless mining is carried on. If the patentee, or someone to whom he sells the patented former national forest acres, wants to cut off all the trees, or build a lodge, or a whole subdivision, I suppose it is then his business. It is private land.

This outrageous result was illustrated by the well-known Al Sarena case, which was investigated by two committees of the 84th Congress.

The need for extending to all national forests the reform which has been realized in the case of several individual national forests has been conclusively demonstrated. My bill would effectively accomplish this purpose.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO SELECTION OF SENATE MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the junior Senator

from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate with regard to the selection of the Senate members of committees of conference.

Mr. President, the question of how Senate conferees shall be selected is one which has repeatedly given rise to controversy in recent decades. The question arises because the Senate rules are silent on this highly important aspect of our procedures. It is the purpose of our resolution to add a provision to the rules dealing with this question, to prevent controversy and conflict on this point in the future.

Our proposed rule would incorporate the principle stated in Cleaves' Manual, which is included in the Senate Manual, that Senate conferees are chosen so as to reflect the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the issues to be considered in the conference.

Mr. Watkins and Mr. Riddick, in their handbook entitled "Senate Procedure," likewise state that conferees are designated by friends of the measure, who are in sympathy with the prevailing view of the Senate.

However, the procedure set forth in the manuals is not always followed. As we all know, the practice is for the senior members of the committee or subcommittee handling the bill to be appointed Senate conferees. Thus, the Senate is frequently represented on a particular bill by Senators who voted against the Senate position, and in favor of the House position, on the bill as a whole or particular provisions of it.

This is an awkward situation for all concerned. It is awkward both for the conferees and for the majority of the Senate, who—however much they respect and honor the conferees as individuals—can hardly be blamed for preferring to be represented by conferees in sympathy with the measure. As was said by an English parliamentarian quoted in Jefferson's manual, "The child is not to be put to a nurse that cares not for it."

At the present time, if a Senator wishes to protest that the practice as stated in the manuals is not being adhered to, he must publicly or privately challenge the conferees who have been designated and ask one or more to step aside. For obvious reasons, this is seldom done. It was last done, I believe, in 1952 on the submerged lands bill. When, however, a Senator does raise the question, the necessary changes are usually made to give the majority of the Senate a majority of conferees. This happened in the 1952 case.

Under our proposed rule, the committee chairman or other manager of the bill would suggest the list of proposed conferees to the Chair in accordance with existing practice. In the large majority of cases the conferees, chosen by seniority from the appropriate committee, will favor the Senate position on matters in dispute between the two Houses. In these cases there would be no change in present practice. In the few cases where an adjustment had to be made, one of which unhappily occurred a few weeks ago, the senior committee or subcommittee members who may be in disagreement with the Senate position on a provision in dispute between the two Houses would still be appointed so long as they did not make up a majority of the Senate conferees. In almost all cases the proposed requirement could be met simply by adding other members from the committee or by substituting one member of the committee for another.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum which traces this controversy through the years and cites some of the leading cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 118), submitted by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters of disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee."

The memorandum presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED RULE RELATING TO SELECTION OF SENATE MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

This memorandum summarizes the arguments in support of a resolution to add the following paragraph at the conclusion of rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate:

"3. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters of disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee."

A RULE IS NEEDED

The Standing Rules of the Senate are virtually silent on the subject of appointment of the Senate members of committees of conference, the applicable rule (rule XXIV) merely stating: "* * * All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint."

In practice, the members have been elected only once in modern times (on the Muscle Shoals bill in 1925). In all other instances, the Chair has been authorized to make the appointments, and it is the practice for the Presiding Officer to have the Senators suggested to him by the chairman of the appropriate committee or other member in charge of the bill.

Since before the time of Jefferson the principle has been acknowledged that the majority of conferees should represent the prevailing view of the body on the bill to be considered. The current manuals state that this is Senate practice. Yet in the routine handling of bills, the alternative practice has grown up of appointing the senior members of either the committee or the subcommittee which considered the legislation.

Necessarily, the prevailing view principle and the seniority practice come into conflict on some bills, and at such times either the principle or the practice must give way. If on such an occasion no Senator makes an issue of the appointment of conferees—as is usually the case—the seniority practice is routinely followed, resulting in the appointment of conferees unsympathetic to the prevailing view of the Senate.

The most recent such instance occurred on March 25 of this year, when four of the five Senate conferees on H.R. 5640, the temporary unemployment compensation bill, had voted against the Senate version, and in favor of the House version, of the bill to be considered by the conference.

When, on the other hand, an issue has been made of the conflict between principle and practice, the prevailing view principle has usually been adhered to, but often only after cumbersome and embarrassing maneuvers. Ordinarily, the maneuvering has taken place behind the scenes, but sometimes it has broken out into acrimonious controversy on the Senate floor. Friends of the measure have found themselves in the embarrassing position of appearing to challenge the integrity of senior Senators. The senior Senators have found themselves in the equally embarrassing position of having to choose between resigning under protest or subjecting themselves to criticism for insisting upon representing a Senate position with which they were out of sympathy.

To write into rule the recognized prevailing view principle would provide an orderly procedure for the future and obviate further controversy on the question.

THE PREVAILING VIEW PRINCIPLE HAS LONG BEEN ACKNOWLEDGED

1. The manuals recognize the principle

Cleaves' Manual, which was reported to the Senate pursuant to a Senate resolution in 1900 and which is incorporated in the Senate Manual, states in section 17:

"In the selection of the managers. * * * Of course the majority party and the prevailing opinion have the majority of the managers. It is also almost the invariable practice to select managers from the members of the committee which considered the bill. * * * But sometimes in order to give representation to a strong or prevailing sentiment in the House the Speaker goes outside the ranks of the committee."

This section of Cleaves' Manual is taken from section 1383 of Hinds' "Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States, published by authority of a joint resolution of the Congress approved in 1898.

The current House Manual and Rules contains even stronger language on this point (sec. 536).

2. Presiding officers have asserted the principle

In 1896, when Senator Hill of New York, objected to the Chair's going outside the ranks of the Committee which had considered the bill in naming a conferee, the presiding officer stated that "* * * no new precedent has been established by the Chair. It has been the custom of the Senate for a great many years to appoint other than a member of the committee reporting a bill

on the conference committee" (54: 2, RECORD, p. 3857).

In 1935, Vice President Garner announced that "hereafter the present occupant of the Chair expects to exercise some discretion in the matter of selecting conferees when the Senate authorizes him to make the appointments." The Minority Leader said his understanding of the rule was that "the majority, at least, of the conferees must be sympathetic with the prevailing opinion, which must be the majority of the Senate who support the measure. * * *" Vice President Garner replied, "That will certainly be the policy of the present occupant of the Chair" (73: 1, RECORD, p. 5296).

3. Many individual Senators have cited and supported the principle

During consideration of the Oklahoma statehood bill, in 1905 and 1906, Senator Teller said:

"The rule has been in parliamentary bodies, not only in this country, but in others, particularly in Great Britain, that when a measure * * * comes * * * from another body, the friends of the measure as it passed the body (and it is true in the other House as well as this) take charge of it from that time on. When we shall have reached the point * * * that there is to be a conference, they are entitled to a majority in the conference" (58: 3, RECORD, p. 2815).

"Whenever a conference committee is created, it is created to bring the mind of the other body to that of this body, and to bring them together. It is not to represent the view of the minority, but to represent, if possible, the majority. Upon that theory the majority of the proposition that passes this body is entitled by custom and usage and on principle to name the committee. A majority only of this body can pass a bill * * * this body then is entitled to have a friendly committee. * * *

"So far have the English authorities gone on this subject in Parliament that they have declared that it was the duty, when a man was put on a conference committee or on any other committee to deal with a subject to which he was hostile, to refuse to become a member of the conference committee or any other committee. As was said by a distinguished English writer on Parliamentary law, and as is quoted approvingly in Jefferson's manual, 'the child is not to be put to a nurse that cares not for it.' * * * It is only * * * in modern times—that the custom has grown up to allow the chairman of the committee, however hostile he may be to the bill as it passes the Senate, to designate who shall deal with the House in the effort by a conference to bring the House to the sentiment of the Senate. Everyone can see that logically the friends of the measure are the proper ones to represent the matter to the conferees on the part of the House and win them to the senatorial mind" (59: 2, RECORD, p. 4155).

During the 1906 debate on the same question, Senator Foraker (Ohio) said: "* * * the rule of the Senate which I * * * evoke in this instance would but give * * * us * * * the benefit of the general rule that obtains, laid down by all parliamentary writers, that those who are the friends of a proposition should go to the conference to represent it" (59: 2, RECORD, p. 4155).

During consideration of the Army appropriation bill in 1888, Senator Hawley (Connecticut) asserted that the rules required "that two of the conferees shall be Senators friendly to the action of the Senate." The Chair thereupon stated that, in practice, conferees "are designated by the friends of the measure" (50: 1, RECORD, p. 7223).

During consideration of the Cuban intervention resolution in 1898, Senator Stewart (Nevada) said: "I remember that until quite recently in making selection of conferees, the Chair always has in view the idea of representing the majority of the Senate upon that particular question where there is a difference, and those constituting the majority in favor of the measure, are entitled to have a majority of the committee to represent their views. That has been the rule; and I have never known an exception to it until 1890. It was stated frequently by the older Members 30 years ago that that was binding in all cases" (55: 2, RECORD, pp. 4027–4028).

On the same occasion, Senator Frye (Maine) said: "* * * in my judgment, in my place as conferee there should be appointed some Senator on the committee who holds views diametrically opposite to mine. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Foraker] is the real father of the proposition to recognize the Cuban Republic now. He was persistent in committee, has been persistent since, and if I were presiding officer of the Senate, I would appoint Senator Foraker as one of the conferees on that committee" (55: 2, RECORD, p. 4030).

During consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill in 1925 (68: 2, RECORD, pp. 2552–2563), Senator Underwood (Alabama) moved for election of conferees in order to avert the appointment of the senior members of the Committtee on Agriculture and Forestry, saying: "* * * according to the rules and the precedents I think we are entitled to conferees who reflect the last vote of the Senate in passing the bill" (id., p. 2552).

And Senator Norris (Nebraska) who was the chairman of the Committe on Agriculture and Forestry who would be bypassed, said: "* * * we ought to appoint conferees who believe in the action the Senate has taken and are in sympathy with it. * * * This bill that was passed by the Senate—the Coolidge-Underwood bill—was opposed by me almost in its entirety. If we follow what I think we should follow—the right kind of an honest rule—then when the conferees are appointed I should not be on the conference committee from the Senate. * * * I had determined, even before any suggestions had been made, that I would not accept appointment on the conference committee, because, to my mind, I would almost have to stultify myself. I did not believe in the bill; I had no faith in the action taken by the Senate; I was sincerely bitterly opposed to it, and it seemed to me that I should eliminate myself and ought to stay off the committee. * * * I think the fundamental proposition that those friendly to legislation should be appointed on conference committees is correct" (id., p. 2555).

On the same occasion, Senator Smith (South Carolina) said: "I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that when the majority have expressed themselves touching the principle of legislation, those in sympathy with it ought, if possible, to go on the conference committee to meet the objections to that principle which come from the other House" (id., p. 2559).

On the same occasion, Senator Edge (New Jersey) said: "* * * Speaking entirely apart from the legislation at issue, it appeals to me that the rule of seniority, so far as it applies to the naming of conferees, is a very unfortunate one. * * * I believe conferees appointed on any measure should be Senators convinced that the measure they are to consider in conference is correct and is right. * * * They should go into conference with the enthusiasm of believing the measure should become a law" (id., p. 2560).

On the same occasion, Senator Heflin (Alabama) said: "* * * there is no doubt that the dominant thought of the Senate is entitled to be represented on the conference committee, and when we seek to get Senators who represent that thought and have to disregard Senators who are bitterly antagonistic to the view of the Senate we make no reflection upon those latter Senators" (ib., p. 2561).

SENIORITY PRACTICES HAVE FREQUENTLY BEEN ABANDONED IN ORDER TO REFLECT THE PREVAILING VIEW

Ada Chenoweth McCown whose study of conference practice in the first 70 Congresses ("The Congressional Conference Committee" Columbia University Press 1927) is the authoritative work on this subject wrote that seniority and committee membership had little to do with the selection of managers for conferences during the first 30 Congresses. By 1848 she noted that seniority standing on committees appeared to have some influence on choice of managers by the House, but was still not the general practice of that Chamber. In the Senate there was no evidence of a seniority practice by that date (pp. 61–63).

During the last half of the 19th century and during the 20th century the seniority practice grew but on occasions when the issue was raised that the "prevailing view" principle was being violated the seniority practice was repeatedly abandoned to permit the majority of the Senate to have the majority of the Senate conferees.

In some such cases the original appointments were made without strict adherence to seniority. In others the original appointments were made according to seniority but were followed by resignations—sometimes promised in advance—to permit substitution of Senators favorable to the Senate view.

Examples of both procedures follow:

1. Departure from seniority in original appointments

Federal Reserve Act (1913): Every Democratic member of the Banking and Currency Committee was appointed except Senator Hitchcock (Nebraska) second-ranking Democrat (RECORD, Dec. 13, 1913, p. 1230).

Chinese Exclusion Act (1902): Senator Reed (Pennsylvania) was passed over in favor of more junior committee members (57: 1, RECORD, p. 4424).

Cuban Intervention (1898): After a protest had been voiced by Senator Foraker (Ohio) that a majority of the prospective conferees did not support the Senate position, Senator Frye (Maine) who would have been a conferee had the seniority rule been followed suggested that the Chair appoint Senator Foraker in his place. The Chair adopted this suggestion (55: 2, RECORD, pp. 4027–4032).

Displaced Persons Act amendment (1950): An objection was voiced to the original slate of seven conferees proposed by Senator McCarran (Nebraska) on the ground that four of them had opposed a substitute which was adopted by the Senate. Senator McCarran thereupon withdrew his proposed names and moved that the Chair appoint conferees. The Vice President then appointed five conferees, including only three of the original group proposed by Senator McCarron, giving a majority of 4 to 1 in favor of the majority view of the Senate (81: 2, RECORD, pp. 4802–4803).

2. Resignations of senior members to permit substitutions

Muscle Shoals (1925): All three of the Senators elected by the Senate to the Conference Committee (Norris, of Nebraska; McNary, of Oregon; and Smith, of South Carolina) resigned following their election because they were opposed to the measure which passed the Senate. Following their resignation, other appointments were made in order from the committee and three other Senators (Keyes, of New Hampshire; Capper, of Kansas; and Ransdell, of Louisiana) resigned for the same reason, thus making possible a majority of conferees favorable to the measure.

Federal Revenue Act (1936): Senators Couzens, of Michigan and Keyes, of New Hampshire resigned immediately after appointment, insisting they were out of sympathy with the bill (74:2, RECORD, p. 10266).

Agricultural Adjustment Act (1938): Senators Norris, of Nebraska and McNary, of Oregon resigned after appointment, the latter explaining that it had been "an unbroken rule of mine that when I oppose a bill I refuse to act as a conferee" (75:2, RECORD, p. 1768). They were replaced by Senators Frazier, of North Dakota and Capper, of Kansas.

Submerged Lands Act (1952): After conferees were appointed on the Submerged Lands Act bill, Senator Long, of Louisiana protested that three of the five had voted against the so-called Holland-Connally substitute which had been approved by the Senate. Senator Long contended the provision of Cleaves' Manual, quoted above, had been violated. He entered a motion that the Senate reconsider the appointment of conferees (82:2, RECORD, p. 3580).

On the following day, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, announced that one of the conferees, Senator McFarland, of Arizona, had asked to be excused from service on the committee and that the next two senior men on the committee, Senators ANDERSON, of New Mexico and Lehman, of New York, had made like requests because they, too, had opposed the substitute amendment which had prevailed. The next Senator in order, Senator Long, accepted appointment and withdrew his motion to reconsider (82:2, RECORD, p. 3678).

On other occasions, protests at the appointment of conferees not in sympathy with the prevailing Senate opinion have been registered, but withdrawn upon assurance by the conferees that they would faithfully support the Senate position despite their own divergent views. Yet the necessity for such demeaning public assurances would not arise were it not for the doubt that inevitably exists when the child is put to a nurse that cares not for it.

Whenever the question of abandoning the seniority system is raised on a particular bill, the issue become one of personalities. As was so notably the case in the lengthy and harsh debate on appointment of conferees on the Muscle Shoals bill, Senators seeking to assert the right of the majority to select the Senate managers are accused of impugning the integrity and honor of the senior Senators. At the same time, the senior Senators who would be bypassed are placed in a bad light if in other cases other committee chairmen and ranking Members have been trusted to handle bills with which they were not in agreement.

If the proposed rule is adopted, then the selection of conferees in sympathy with the bill in question will be automatic. The issue will not have to be raised on the Senate floor, as in the past, giving rise to divisive debate and recriminations. And the principle of the prevailing view, which has been so often violated, will be regularly honored.

YOUTH CONSERVATION ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 812, the Youth Conservation Act of 1959, which I introduced, on behalf of myself and several other Senators, on January 29, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ANTILYNCHING BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators HENNINGS, CASE of New Jersey, and ALLOTT may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1848) to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes, introduced by me on April 30, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1884) to transfer the administration of the program for distribution of surplus agricultural food commodities to needy persons, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for himself and other Senators, on May 7, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce his appointment, under authority of Senate Resolution 48, agreed to April 20, 1959, as amended, of the following additional members of the Select Senate Committee on National Water Resources; namely, Senator THOMAS MARTIN, of Iowa; Senator GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming; Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah; and Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND, RELATING TO PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the following documents were submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 2, 1959: First, an amendment to the agreement for cooperation with the Government of Switzerland which was signed on June 21, 1956; second, a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and, third, a letter from the President to the Atomic Energy Commission approving the amendment to the agreement for cooperation.

The amendment would modify the agreement for cooperation to permit the transfer of quantities of special nuclear materials, including U^{235}, U^{233}, and plutonium, on an as-may-be-agreed basis, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

I ask that these documents be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland desiring to amend the agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland signed at Washington on June 21, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement for cooperation"), agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraph A of article IV of the agreement for cooperation is hereby amended to read as follows:

"A. Research Materials

"Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchanges of information as provided in article III and under the provisions set forth in article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be exchanged for research purposes other than fueling reactors in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially."

ARTICLE II

This amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the agreement for cooperation.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, this 24th day of April 1959.

For the Government of the United States of America:

IVAN B. WHITE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, Department of State.

JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Switzerland:
Ambassador HENRY DE TORRENTE,
Government of Switzerland.

This is certified to be a true copy of the signed original.

W. M. FULLERTON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland concerning civil uses of atomic energy and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The amendment has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Switzerland in accordance with the policy which you have established. This amendment would modify the agreement for cooperation signed by the Government

of the United States and the Government of Switzerland on June 21, 1956.

The only revision being made in the agreement for cooperation is contained in article I of the amendment which would permit the transfer of quantities of special nuclear materials, including U^{235}, U^{233}, and plutonium, on as-may-be-agreed basis, for defined research projects related to the peaceful use of atomic energy.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland and placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. McCONE,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 22, 1959.

Hon. JOHN A. McCONE,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Under date of April 15, 1959, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland concerning civil uses of atomic energy, and authorize its execution.

The recommended amendment has been reviewed. The only revision it makes in the agreement for cooperation is that it permits the transfer of quantities of special nuclear materials, including U^{235}, U^{233} and plutonium, on an as-may-be-agreed basis, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby (1) determine that the performance of the proposed amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; (2) approve the proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Switzerland enclosed with your letter of April 15, 1959; and (3) authorize the execution of the proposed amendment for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this amendment will enhance the very productive program of cooperation between the United States and Switzerland in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DECLINE IN UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have before me a news release issued by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, the title of which is: "Mitchell Predicts Era of Prosperity." The statement speaks not only of the unemployment situation, to which attention was called yesterday, particularly the fact that unemployment in April was 735,000 less than in March, which was more than twice the expected seasonal drop for that month. It also points out that factory wages reached an all-time high in April, averaging $89.87 a week. The statement also reports that spendable income in the United States, after taxes, reached an all-time high in the first quarter of 1959, and that new construction has been running at a record monthly rate of $4.5 billion since last January. Finally, the Secretary said:

Now let me make one thing clear: This is very good news for our country, but it cannot lead us to ignore the fact that there remain valleys of trouble in our prosperity, where people live who cannot find jobs. In our general rejoicing we must not forget them. We must have adequate area assistance legislation, and we must have an improved program of Federal-State unemployment insurance.

I assume that the Secretary referred to the area assistance legislation which was recommended by the President, and not to the so-called Douglas bill which was passed by the Senate, to which I was opposed. Indeed, I had some reservations about the administration bill submitted to implement the President's recommendations. Principally it lacked strong enough provisions to prevent industry pirating, but it was a far better bill than that which, to my regret, the Senate approved. I commend and applaud the Secretary of Labor for the excellent statement which he has issued. It is gratifying to all of us, I believe, to realize that the serious unemployment situation which has concerned all Members of Congress in the past year and a half is showing very great improvement, indeed. It is truly a cause for rejoicing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Mitchell's statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MITCHELL PREDICTS ERA OF PROSPERITY

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell today told a business and professional group in Miami that the United States was entering an era of unprecedented prosperity in which working men and women would share as they had never shared before in history.

The Secretary listed those economic facts that made him confident of the future well-being of American workers. They include:

Sixty-five million men and women were employed in April, 1,200,000 more than in March, and an all-time high for the month.

Unemployment in April was 735,000 less than in March, better than twice the expected seasonal drop for the month.

Factory wages hit an all-time high in April, averaging $89.87 per week.

The spendable income in the United States, after taxes, reached an all-time high in the first quarter of 1959 of $1,823 for each man, woman and child—all 176 million of us.

The buying power of workers' pay checks was the highest in history in April, because the cost of living has remained virtually unchanged for the longest period on record.

New construction has been running at a record monthly rate of $4.5 billion since last January, up 15 percent over last year.

More steel was produced in March and April of this year than in any other 2 months in our history, including wartime.

New car sales in April were at a 22-month high.

The value of goods and services reached a record annual rate of $465 billion in the first quarter of this year.

The Secretary added: "Now let me make one thing clear: This is very good news for our country, but it cannot lead us to ignore the fact that there remain valleys of trouble in our prosperity, where people live who cannot find jobs. In our general rejoicing we must not forget them. We must have adequate area assistance legislation, and we must have an improved program for Federal-State unemployment insurance."

CIVIL DEFENSE NOW BARGING INTO STRIKE DUTY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, civil defense as it has been handled in the Nation and as it is presently being handled under the guise of Office of Civil Defense Mobilization is a wasteful, unnecessary, and enormously expensive bureaucracy. It is as outmoded as flintlock muskets and tallow dips, and even as outmoded as Civil War cannonballs.

Surely the Armed Forces of the United States—especially the Army—are best suited to handle civil defense functions. At the outset of the War Between the States, which we in the North call the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus. He became a virtual dictator.

If an attack were made upon missile installations in this country by forces of the Soviet Union firing missiles with nuclear warheads from submarines off our coasts or intercontinental ballistic missiles coming from the Soviet Union, it is a certainty that our Armed Forces would immediately take over complete authority, in order to save lives and to engage in retaliatory warfare.

It is certain that no civilians with armbands would be permitted to interfere with the Armed Forces in the defense of our Nation.

Mr. President, here is a quotation from a recent news dispatch from Hazard, Ky., where three battalions of Kentucky National Guard were called into active duty by the Governor of Kentucky, to help maintain order in the coal-mine labor troubles in that area of Kentucky:

Brig. Gen. Jesse Lindsey, Kentucky Civil Defense Director, toured Perry and Leslie Counties today in a jeep with a National Guard liaison plane flying overhead. The plane kept the jeep in constant radio touch with Guard communications headquarters on a mountaintop at Hazard.

So, Mr. President, it appears that in the great State of Kentucky the civil defense organization is being used for strike duty.

Mr. President, in that State, as in Ohio—and, in fact, as in all of our States—local police, county sheriffs, State police, and the State National Guard are available to protect property and prevent people from being killed when labor disputes or any sort of mob violence gets out of hand.

Furthermore, if things are completely out of line in my State of Ohio, in Kentucky, or in any of the other States, it is a fact that the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marines are available to protect property and save lives. According to this news dispatch from Kentucky, we have now an added starter, with the civil defense, headed by so-called Brig. Gen. Jesse Lindsey, barging into the picture.

Mr. President, of course, Brig. Gen. Jesse Lindsey, who appears to be running the civil defense show in Kentucky, is

evidently a plumose pipsqueak, as witnessed by the fact that he is apparently clinging tenaciously to his former military title.

Mr. President, it may be that civil defense bureaucrats, such as this military-title-clinging Mr. Lindsey, civil defense director of Kentucky, who have very little to do except to sit in their elaborate offices, issue conflicting plans, and draw their salaries, while the taxpayers sweat, feel that it is essential, in order to retain their jobs and to secure increased appropriations from the Congress, to move into more and more situations with which we in this Nation have always been able to cope before there ever was an organization called civil defense.

Let me say, Mr. President, that it came as a shock to me to learn that a paid civil defense official has been using his position and his organization for strike duty.

Many of the thousands and thousands of good American citizens who have volunteered for civil defense work, and have really spent many hours of work without compensation, would undoubtedly be shocked were they to know that in this instance a State civil defense director engaged in strike duty.

These good citizens who have been volunteer workers can surely perform a more needful public service in their respective communities as volunteer firemen, volunteer auxiliary policemen, and volunteer deputy sheriffs, to be available in times of fire, floods, hurricanes, and other disasters which sometimes afflict our communities.

Surely, they will find it revolting that a civil defense director has barged into the activity of engaging in strike duty.

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this is the year in which the oil industry throughout the United States commemorates a century of progress. The vision and perseverence of Col. Edwin P. Drake were rewarded when, on August 27, 1859, he brought in the first well ever drilled for oil. It occurred on a little stream called Oil Creek, near Titusville, in northern Pennsylvania.

There was born then the industry which has since changed the face of the world, made Americans the most mobile people in history, and brought more progress in the past 100 years than man had achieved in the thousand years preceding.

The August 27, 1859, success of Colonel Drake was duplicated just 2 months later in my State of West Virginia when a hardy pioneer, Charles H. Shattock, successfully completed drilling of the first commercial oil well along the Hughes River near Sistersville, W. Va.

For centuries, men had skimmed oil from the surface of ponds and other natural outlets—using it for heat and light, for medicinal purposes, and for such uses as the caulking of boats. But only a hundred years ago were man's first efforts crowned with success in his systematic attempt to unlock this treasure house of nature.

While the world well knows of the tremendous resources of energy abounding in the coal fields of West Virginia, many people have forgotten that our State also held a preeminent place in the early development of the oil industry.

The community of Sistersville on the Ohio River in Tyler County, W. Va., was first settled in 1802, and was plotted in 1815, but 67 years ago Sistersville was an early and typical oil-boom city. There an important part was played in the history of the oil industry. Many of the industry's personalities of subsequent national fame experienced their early training there when, in 1891, the Sistersville pool discovery well produced its first oil. There, in 1894, was completed the then largest gas well, with an estimated open flow of 100 million cubic feet. And there is the birthplace of the natural gas-gasoline industry.

We are reminded of these developments and of the significance of Sistersville—as well as the larger role of oil in human affairs—in a most inspiring address delivered at the Sistersville Oil Centennial held April 16 this year by the noted oilman and civic leader of Pittsburgh, Mr. Paul Gregory Benedum.

The Sistersville and Tyler County Board of Trade made possible the celebration held on that date commemorating the 100th anniversary of the discovery of oil. I was delighted to be present for a part of the day's well-planned activities. It was most fortunate in having as the toastmaster at the culminating oil centennial ceremonies the Honorable Sam T. Mallison, former State auditor of West Virginia, and distinguished journalist, who has achieved eminence in the oil industry.

The speaker for the occasion, Paul Benedum, is a West Virginian, the son of one of the early pioneers of the oil industry, and the nephew of the world-famous "wildcatter," Michael L. (Mike) Benedum. He delivered his thought-provoking speech on the contribution of oil to human progress and to the destiny of America. Discoursing on the theme that we have reached "A Point of No Return," Paul Benedum referred to the present renaissance of the oil industry in West Virginia, as follows:

> The history of the oil industry is a symbol of American "do or die" achievements. The great events of human progress—those that have changed the way men live—are not always easy to find in the history books. Too many histories dwell on political changes—changes in the mastery of men over other men. Most political changes are not basic; they are limited in scope and time. They affect a nation, a culture, a civilization; they last for a decade or a century. They do not affect all men for all time to come.
>
> The basic changes come from man's mastery over nature. They change the way men live forever after. They are not wrought by conquerors or rulers or even by statesmen; they are wrought by innovators—men who learn how to do new things.
>
> We owe the way we live in the discoverers and inventors—our unknown ancestors who learned to use fire; the prehistoric men who first grew crops; the nameless geniuses who developed the wheel; the early men who discovered iron and the later men who made steel abundant; the men who drilled the first modern oil well. To such men we should raise our monuments. They are the men who change man's way of living. Their discoveries are the great events of human progress.
>
> Because of Drake, the innovator, today we live in an entirely different world from that of a generation ago. We have been propelled into the space age at jet speed. I don't think we should shed nostalgic tears at the passing of what we call "the good old days," because really they were not so good as they appear in retrospect. Instead, we should seek for the central theme of evolution. We must adjust ourselves to its broad new horizons and equip ourselves and our children to meet its terrifying responsibilities. We must face up to the fact that we have long since passed the point of no return. We cannot go backward. We must go forward in the fulfillment of our evolutionary destiny.
>
> In appraising our strength of today and tomorrow, we start with a vast treasure of material resources, but any valuation of them would be spurious and misleading if it did not take into consideration two other factors—human resources, and a free, stable, and solvent government.
>
> Natural resources are worthless without human resources in the form of men of courage and dedicated purpose—especially equipped to meet their respective responsibilities. And both would be futile and unproductive without free and stable government. The three elements—materials, men, and government—form the tripod in which is wrapped up our individual and national destiny. Any weakness in any one leg of that tripod throws the whole into unbalance and threat of collapse.

It is appropriate to point out, too, that as the first century of oil progress drew to a close, another resource, salt crystals left by an ancient sea, had been discovered in the area where the oil began in 1892 to show in increasing and better-paying quantities in the Sistersville pool of the Marshall-Wetzel-Tyler counties area of West Virginia—one of the largest and richest developed in that State.

This salt crystal discovery from drilling previously carried on by the oil and gas drillers of another day heralds what may be a second century of even greater progress. It gave birth to the founding 40 years ago of the petrochemicals industry in West Virginia and, of course, it is a substantial prediction that upward to 50 percent of all chemicals made in the United States will be derived from oil and gas.

And, referring to gas, from its humble, small-scale beginning in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia, the gas industry has grown to be America's fifth largest.

Like coal and oil, natural gas and the gas industry have been important factors in the development of West Virginia—but, as Paul Benedum so properly declared in his address at Sistersville, even these "natural resources are worthless without human resources in the form of men of courage and dedicated purpose especially equipped to meet their respective responsibilities."

West Virginians are men and women of courage. They are dedicated Americans who will equip themselves to meet their responsibilities for the challenging work on the frontiers of the future.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I noted with pleasure yesterday not only the splendid improvement in employment throughout the country and the decrease in unemployment, but also the paeans of joy with which the figures were received on the other side of the aisle.

I am certainly no prophet of gloom and doom, Mr. President, and I rejoice with all Americans at this long awaited and far overdue upturn in the employment situation. I should like, however, to sound a very short note of warning. Much of the upturn is due to the building up of steel inventories. Steel companies will have to cut back in the third quarter even if there is no strike, and many workers now employed will be out of work again.

Construction is relatively high, but if we as a Congress do not pass a housing bill pretty soon new starts will fall off drastically.

The problem of depressed areas is still with us. Depressed areas existed before the recession and will exist after it has entirely disappeared unless we furnish aid.

The effects of automation are very real. In many industries laid off workers will not be employed again, and new jobs must be created in other industries.

Discrimination in employment is still a serious problem. Nonwhites are underemployed and need new opportunities.

I note for the RECORD that in April of 1957 265,000 Pennsylvanians were seeking work they could not find. Two years later, in April of 1959, despite the strong upturn in employment, 413,000 Pensylvanians were looking for work they could not find.

Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending a conference called by the American Assembly, under the auspices of Columbia University, at Arden House in New York State. Some 60 individuals were gathered there from all areas of the economic spectrum—business leaders, industrialists, executives, labor economists, politicians, and college professors. They found that—

> The average level of unemployment during 1953–58 of 4.7 percent, approximately 3 million unemployed, was too high.

Our present rate of unemployment is 5.8 percent, and our present number of unemployed is in the neighborhood of 3.7 million.

I continue to quote from the findings:

> Reliance on large-scale unemployment to achieve price stability is intolerable in our present society.

Mr. President, I hope that the May employment figures will be better than the April figures. I hope the improvement will continue throughout the year. I suggest, however, that we in the Congress are in no way justified in sweeping under the rug an unemployment condition which is reflected in a figure still far too high for national well-being.

THE STRIKE IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the distinguished present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], in a brief statement made reference to the situation which obtains in eastern Kentucky—the strike in the coalfields which has been marred by breaches of public order. The Senator drew from certain facts the conclusion that the civil defense organization of Kentucky had been used in strike duty.

The Senator was kind enough to give me a copy of his remarks before he made them; and, as I understood his statement, the fact from which he drew his conclusion was that Brig. Gen. Jesse Lindsey, Kentucky civil defense director, toured two counties in eastern Kentucky in a jeep with a National Guard liaison plane flying overhead.

I, of course, can understand and agree with the concern of the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio that the civil defense organization should not be used in strike duty. It would be indefensible. I agree with the Senator wholly upon that point. I appreciate also the Senator's forthrightness. I have great confidence and trust in the statements of the Senator.

I am not familiar with the particular incident he has mentioned respecting Brigadier General Lindsey. I wish to say, however, since I have heard the Senator make his statement, it would not be fair if I did not respond briefly. The situation in Kentucky has been unfortunate. After the strike was called there were breaches of public order, and it appeared after a time that local authorities could not properly control the situation. After some time the Governor of Kentucky, who does not happen to be of my political persuasion but who nevertheless is the Governor of Kentucky and is my Governor, made his decision to send troops into the area. I think the Governor acted with restraint and with judgment. That opinion is held not only by me but also by others. Recently the Courier Journal of Louisville, Ky., a very fine newspaper, published quite a long editorial in which it reviewed the situation in eastern Kentucky and commended the Governor of Kentucky for his judgment in handling the situation and for his final determination to send National Guard troops into the area.

Having stated this background information—although I have been there from time to time and have kept in touch with the situation—I think I can assure the junior Senator from Ohio that the civil defense organization of Kentucky has not been used for strike duty. As I have said, the Senator's conclusions seem to be based only upon the fact that the director of civil defense in Kentucky toured two of the counties.

I know General Lindsey. From what I have heard about him and from what I know about him General Lindsey enjoys a fine reputation in Kentucky. I am not sure whether the general is a member of the National Guard or is a Reserve officer, but in either case I know he is an active member of one of the two organizations. I assume it was probable that because of his position he happened to be in these two counties at that time.

I do not think this is a situation which deserves any prolonged discussion, but I wanted to draw these two conclusions myself: First, I am certain the civil defense organization has not been used in strike duty in Kentucky. Second, knowing General Lindsey, I am sure whatever his purpose was it was considered in line with his duties either in the National Guard or in the Reserve, whichever it may be.

PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce, which was held in Washington this past month, many important subjects were discussed.

One of the most important was the subject of "World Peace Through World Law." This is a matter in which I have been very much interested. In an effort to bring about more effective settlements of disputes between nations by way of international law rather than force, some time ago I submitted Senate Resolution 94, which would delete the reserve clause from our declaration of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the United Nations International Court of Justice.

I am pleased to report that Mr. Henry Luce, the editor in chief of Time magazine, in a speech before the International Chamber of Commerce, indicates support for my proposal—Senate Resolution 94.

I believe that this address by Mr. Luce entitled "Peace Through Law" carries an important message for all Members of Congress, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH LAW

(Address by Mr. Henry Luce, editor in chief, Time, Inc.)

Three weeks ago there was held in Boston a very special conference of lawyers. They met, under the auspices of the American Bar Association, to devise ways and means to advance the rule of law throughout the world, soon.

At that meeting Erwin Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor and now president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said:

"I have a feeling that in this meeting I am in the midst of history in the making."

Gentlemen, I hope that that is the way each and every one of you will feel when you conclude this great congress of businessmen. May you, too, make history, here and now.

Perhaps you can make history by finding some new directions for economic progress in business terms. Or perhaps you will wish to go even further. Perhaps you will wish to unite your energies on something which is really fundamental—fundamental to civilization and therefore to economic progress. That fundamental is the advancement of the rule of law.

The honor and duty which President Cortney has assigned to me today is to put this cause before you.

Economic progress is a tremendous thing in itself. A good part of my life has been devoted to prophesying the age of abundance and to reporting it. The age of abundance has now arrived in America and in Europe. Elsewhere we see poverty and misery, but far from accepting poverty and misery as the normal lot of mankind, every nation is determined to break out from this poverty and the United States is sharing and will share in the fulfillment of this universal purpose by government and by business action.

The furtherance and the wise guidance of the age of abundance is, I presume, the principal business of this gathering. There are many problems to be faced. But the basic trouble with the age of abundance is that it is also the age of insecurity. And I do not refer only to the threat of war. Nor do I refer only to foolish economic policies or to corrupt practices. The trouble with the age of abundance, on a worldwide scale, is that one of its foundations is missing. That foundation is the rule of law—the rule of law both within countries and between countries.

Now, however, the time is coming, and indeed is here, when all over the world leading men are ready to get together to build that foundation. Now is the time for businessmen to make history—to insist that the rule of law shall be exalted and that the arbitrary rule of dictators and demagogs shall be curbed.

There is talk these days of summits. The true summit toward which we must start immediately to climb is the rule of law throughout the world. In that effort lies th best hope of peace. And equally important, if we set out determinedly toward that goal we shall find that our path through all the unknown hazards of the future will he marked by coherence rather than by confusion, will be marked by confidence and courage rather than by doubts and fears.

The rule of law? Is that not the business of lawyers? Or of governments and politicians? Yes, it is and the lawyers are now at work—lawyers in America and lawyers in every nation of the free world. As for governments and politicians, they have been laggard. But governments too, and political leaders, are now ready to move toward the achievement of the rule of law.

The last speech made by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before he went to the hospital was devoted exclusively to this subject. He said: "Often peace is identified with the imposition by strong nations of their 'benevolent' rule upon the weaker. Most of these efforts collapsed in war. * * * But the world of today is very different from the world of past centuries. It cannot be ruled. Hence the time is ripe for the rule of law." When Foster Dulles says something he means it. We know that; the world knows it. In that speech Secretary Dulles was sounding the trumpet of a great advance. And I have reason to believe that Secretary Herter will press forward in the same direction, vigorously and soon.

Only a few days ago Vice President NIXON took up this cause. He said: "the time has now come to take the initiative in * * * establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force."

Both Secretary Dulles and the Vice President were filling out the meaning of the most significant passage in President Eisenhower's January state of the Union message. In that message President Eisenhower said: "It is my purpose to intensify efforts * * * to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

Last week Vice President NIXON made two specific recommendations for U.S. initiative.

One, already promised by the President in January, would revitalize the World Court. The other would name the Court as umpire of any future agreements between East and West (as for example over Berlin), the agreeing nations to be bound by the Court's decision in any dispute over what the agreement means. These two proposals are part of a major administration campaign to hasten the day foreseen by the late Senator Taft whom NIXON quoted. Senator Taft said: "I do not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world except by establishing law between nations and equal justice under law. * * * The time will come when public opinion will support the decision of any reasonably impartial tribunal based on justice."

The World Court is certainly a "reasonably impartial tribunal," whose 15 eminent judges know as much international law as there is to be known. Unfortunately, theirs is also the most unused Court in the world. It has decided an average of less than one case a year since the U.N. was founded. A primary reason for this scandalous neglect lies right on the doorstep of the United States.

This reason is the Connally amendment, a reservation to the terms by which we accepted the Court's jurisdiction in 1946. The Court neither has nor wants jurisdiction over essentially domestic disputes; but the Connally amendment makes the United States sole judge of what is domestic and what is not. This is bad law and has been ever since Sir Edward Coke in 1610 declared the sound legal principle that no man can be the judge in his own case. (The American Bar Association has long opposed the Connally amendment.) But it is also bad foreign policy, with a built-in boomerang effect against American interests. The Connally amendment has not only weakened the Court by setting a bad example to other nations; it has robbed us of recourse to it. Until the Connally amendment is amended, as the administration urges, our bad example will keep the Court in its present scandalous idleness, and also frustrate any U.S. claim to be a champion of law in world affairs.

Thus I have laid before you samples of the importance which the Government of the United States now attaches to the advancement of the rule of law. The measures to which I have referred are only first steps. I predict that in the next few years the Government of the United States will take giant strides toward the strengthening and broadening of the rule of law.

Now let me get back to the lawyers—and then we will ask ourselves about businessmen. That meeting in Boston 3 weeks ago was immediately followed by a similar meeting in Chicago. Other regional meetings are scheduled for the near future. If enough practical progress is made, then in 1961 there will be held somewhere on this planet an assembly of leading jurists of all the free nations—and I hope of the unfree nations too.

All this activity stems from the historic meeting of the American Bar Association 2 years ago at London—London, the seat of most of our American ideas about law and some of our ideas about commerce. At that meeting a remarkable young man, Charles S. Rhyne, became president of the Bar Association and, taking up the sense of that meeting, he has inspired hundreds of his fellow lawyers, here and overseas, to help us make the rule of law the major theme of all international action. In the past 2 years, American lawyers have gone all over the globe—to Vienna, Lugano, New Delhi, Cologne, Tokyo, Warsaw, and in these places have met with lawyers from many other lands in attempts to find common grounds for understanding of every kind of problem that can arise in international law—problems reaching from the technical details of court procedures to the most fundamental principles of legal theory.

The lawyers of America are on the march—in their historic role of being the creators of the institutions of justice and of order. Governments and statesmen are now saying that, after so many horrible decades of international disorder, the time is ripe to demand something better than peace-by-terror; the time is ripe to build new institutions of law and justice and to invigorate all the institutions that already exist. The time is ripe, therefore, for the enlightened businessmen of the world to make this cause their own. If that happens here, if you agree—then it is certain that giant strides will be taken soon and within a very few years the whole aspect of man's world will have altered radically for the better.

As businessmen, your first and special responsibility is for the world of business. It is primarily up to you, with the help of lawyers and experts who are ready to help—it is up to you to see to it that the rule of law prevails in every corner of the business world. By that I mean that it would be good business if businessmen would spend less time and money fighting for or against certain rules and regulations which directly affect their own pocketbooks and would spend more time and money fighting for basic and universal rules under which all business could prosper.

In recent years, the volume of international trade has grown with amazing rapidity in spite of all manner of arbitrary obstacles and restrictions. All of us know the insecurity that envelopes international business; if world business could get off the tenterhooks of legal uncertainty, its rate of growth would be many times as great as it has been.

A leading German banker, Hermann Abs, has made a proposal of the greatest interest and importance. He started from a practical banker's concern for such matters as defaulted loans and the expropriation of foreign capital. He wanted to deal with these on a general basis of establishing what was called a grand international convention which would bind the signatory nations to observe fair rules. To apply and interpret these rules he proposed a court of arbitration. Mr. Abs called his proposal a Magna Charta of international commerce. Here is an example of the vast range and reach of the law; it starts by dealing with practical everyday matters and soon we are speaking in terms of a Magna Carta, with all that name means in the history of civilization.

Similar proposals have been made by the International Chamber of Commerce; now is the time to reactivate those proposals.

An immense vertical distance lies between the everyday practicalities of the international law of commerce and the goal of legal restraint upon the warmaking power of the greatest nations. Yet the reach of law can cover this distance. Law—internal, international, business, and political—is all one fabric—and anything we can do to strengthen and extend the rule of law in our practical affairs will have its effect upon the larger and higher problems of political order.

Therefore, I believe that every enlightened businessman should work to bring about a Magna Carta of international trade and investment. For at stake there is the prosperity of the world—and our American prosperity. At stake there is the future of free enterprise—here in America no less than abroad. At stake there may even be the peace of the world, since nothing could so vitalize the rule of law as to have it extended to all business transactions everywhere on earth. This would give to millions of people the habit of abiding by the law, of trusting in the law, and of prospering in the trust and confidence which only the law can give.

When we speak of the rule of law, the grand end we have in view is justice between men and nations. Law is the only human means we have of reasonably gratifying the

human need for justice and of protecting human freedom. In our age, it is not enough to make the rule effective within a nation—though it must start there. In our age the quest for justice and the establishment of law, the means to justice, must be pursued on a worldwide scale.

Years ago, one of our most popular authors, Mark Twain, was asked to give his legal name and address. He replied: "My name is Samuel Clemens and I reside at 351 Farmington Street, in the city of Hartford, in the county of Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, in the United States of America, in the world, in the solar system, in the universe, in the mind of God."

You will note that the first part of that stipulation is all very legal—city, county, State, Nation. But when you come to the world, there is no longer a legal ring to it. There is nothing lawful about the world; it is a lawless place. When you get beyond the world, all is again legal, for both scientists and theologians assure us that the universe and the mind of God manifest perfect law.

Gentlemen, the task of our generation is to make the world entire a lawful place—to make the world at last a proper legal residence of men.

This is the task in which the legal profession and the governments of the free world must take the lead.

It is also a task which, for every reason, calls for the support of enlightened businessmen. You can be the decisive factor in bringing about the rule of law. By making this cause your own you will indeed be making history—good history. And we shall be able to look to the future not with fear and doubt but with confidence and hope.

U.S. ARMY SIGNS $7.5 MILLION CONTRACT WITH FRENCH MISSILE FIRM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the days and weeks immediately ahead during our negotiations with the Russians, the NATO alliance will face a severe test of strength. Already its will and integrity are being questioned by some timid souls. We can be sure that the Communists will try to sharpen and exploit whatever differences exist between the partners of the NATO community.

I have no doubts about the fundamental will and firmness of our common resolve, but we must keep working to strengthen the alliance even further. In this connection, I would like to congratulate the U.S. Army on its recent decision to purchase two types of French-built antitank missiles for the use of NATO. This decision will promote both the economic and the military strength of the Atlantic community.

One of the problems within the alliance is to achieve an equitable degree of burden sharing.

"Burden sharing," a term used both by the economists and military planners, has military, economic, political, and, I might add, moral implications. It is especially concerned with the manufacture of weapons. We Americans, as leaders of the alliance, have often preferred to use weapons and equipment of American design and manufacture. This is understandable, but it has always seemed to me that this policy should also encourage the development and manufacture of weapons by our allies. NATO achieves its maximum strength when each member of the alliance is prosperous, strong, and enjoys the respect of the other members for its abilities and skills.

The recently announced American contract to procure two French designed and produced antitank missiles is a long step toward building mutual confidence in NATO. Recently, the U.S. Army announced that it has given a $7.5 million contract to Nord Aviation of Paris. This is a straight cash-and-carry arrangement. The costs of this purchase do not come from mutual security funds. The Army has simply found that the French had produced two remote-controlled, antitank missiles which turned out to be the best buy available. The contract calls for a $6.5 million expenditure for the SS–10 missile, which is fully developed and operational, and $1 million to buy and test the SS–11 missile, which has more than double the range of the SS–10.

The value of these weapons is great. The SS–10, which has already been adopted as standard equipment by our Army, has a unit cost of $755; while the more advanced SS–11 will cost about $1,000. These missiles are capable of knocking out any tank in existence, including tanks like our own M–48, 52 tonner, which cost $139,000 each. These new French missiles, designed basically for use with ground forces, will soon be incorporated into the equipment used by our NATO forces in Germany. It is a good guess, and this is no security violation, that in the near future these missiles will also become part of the equipment of our forces in Korea and of the new mobile Strategic Army Corps stationed here in the United States.

This welcome step by the Army should serve as a model for the future. Our European allies represent one of the world's most highly concentrated pools of industrial skills and resources. Too often they have been neglected in building a common defense for the free world. A new policy based on greater use of these resources would have many advantages, including its contribution to greater military standardization, a No. 1 military priority in NATO.

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, who for a number of years has spoken with uncommon wisdom on aviation and NATO matters, recently touched on this problem at a meeting of the World Congress of Flight. He pointed out that NATO relies on about 40 different types of aircraft in its operations, whereas the Warsaw Pact countries use only about 15 types. This has been one of NATO's troublesome problems. In the prepared text of his address, Prince Bernhard said only that there was "hope" that NATO might cooperate more fully as the more advanced weapons are developed. But, when he heard the news about the Army's purchase of the French missiles, he cited it is as a perfect example of one way to improve and strengthen the alliance.

It is clearly in our enlightened self-interest to pursue this new policy further. If we encourage our allies to design and build military equipment, and stimulate that development with our own purchases, the costs of our Military Aid program can be materially reduced. Our allies will be less dependent on expensive American equipment on the one hand, and they can earn badly needed dollar credits on the other.

I congratulate the Army and the Defense Department for its foresighted act in negotiating this contract with Nord Aviation of Paris, because it will help strengthen the military, political, economic and moral sinews of NATO at a crucial time of testing.

DR. HOWARD A. RUSK IS HONORED FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE BATTLE AGAINST EPILEPSY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 1,500,000 Americans are afflicted with epilepsy. At a time when great progress is being made toward prevention and cure of other diseases, at a time when great publicity is being given to efforts to curb other dread scourges which plague mankind, epilepsy continues to wreak havoc with an astounding number of Americans.

A great counterattack is today being mounted by the United Epilepsy Association. By means of varied programs, community service, and public education, the association is helping to lead the epileptic out of the darkness. The association has described its mission as one of erasing injustice, insuring that every American with epilepsy receives proper care, and seeking cures as well as ways of preventing and treating this dread disease.

Public understanding is being promoted through public forums, the mass media, and word of mouth. This truth campaign is designed to teach people to accept epileptics as normal human beings.

The United Epilepsy Association is also supporting research which has already made great strides and which may eventually lead to total control and cure of this ailment.

Finally, the association is helping to establish clinics and community facilities in order to cut down the present shocking fact that less than half of those who have epilepsy are being adequately treated for it.

At a recent ceremony in New York City, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, the doctor-journalist who has established an international reputation as an authority on rehabilitation and who has contributed magnificently to public understanding of the ramifications and challenges of modern medicine, was honored by the United Epilepsy Association for his efforts in the great battle against epilepsy. Because of the importance of the matters discussed and the eminence of the men involved, I ask unanimous consent that the introductory remarks and Dr. Rusk's response be printed in the RECORD, following my comments.

There being no objection, the introduction and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE TO HOWARD A. RUSK, M.D., ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, AND PROFESSOR AND CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY BELLEVUE MEDICAL CENTER, AT CEREMONY APRIL 21, 1959, AT THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 2 EAST 63D STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Dr. H. Houston Merritt, dean of College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, and chairman of the professional advisory council of the United Epilepsy Association, made introductory comments. Dr. Merritt is a neurologist and co-discoverer of Dilantin, the principal anticonvulsive medicine used for controlling epileptic seizures.

REMARKS BY DR. MERRITT

"No man in this country has done more to advance the cause of the handicapped than the one we are honoring today, Dr. Howard A. Rusk. It is almost solely through his efforts that the specialty of physical medicine and rehabilitation has reached the present high level in our country.

"Dr. Rusk's interest in the physically handicapped started with his work in the Armed Forces during World War II. He is now director of the greatest rehabilitation center in the world. In addition to his achievements in the medical field, he has been an important adviser to the President of the United States in the problem of health resources and the Selective Service System.

"Dr. Rusk is a gifted writer and for many years has been associate editor of the New York Times. He has been a leader in the education of the public with regard to problems of patients with epilepsy and in the advancement of the care and treatment of these patients. The United Epilepsy Association is honoring itself in giving this award to Dr. Rusk in recognition of the great work which he is doing for the cause of epilepsy.

"I feel very privileged to introduce Mr. Revell McCallum, the vice president of the United Epilepsy Association, who will present our association's award to Dr. Rusk."

REMARKS BY MR. REVELL M'CALLUM

"Dean Merritt, Dr. Rusk, and distinguished guests. Our president, Mr. Carl Marks, has asked me to express his deep regrets that he is not able to be present while sharing the honors of this notable occasion. As vice president of the United Epilepsy Association, I feel very honored and privileged indeed to present Dr. Rusk with this award, which reads:

" 'For distinguished medical journalism and achieving international understanding in public health and rehabilitation.

" 'Through his worldwide column and significant medical science articles, Dr. Rusk has broken the barrier of scientific technical writings and thus made the knowledge accessible to people everywhere, bringing understanding and enlightenment to millions. His leadership in the fields of international health, education, and welfare is hereby recognized.

" 'CARL MARKS, *President.*

" 'Seal of United Epilepsy Association, April 21, 1959.

" 'H. HOUSTON MERRITT, M.D.,
" 'Chairman, Professional Advisory Council.' "

REMARKS BY DR. RUSK

"Mr. McCallum, Dr. Merritt, I really should say Dean Merritt, and my many friends, I am highly honored and deeply grateful to you for coming today to join with me in receiving the United Epilepsy Association's award for my interest and work in the field of epilepsy.

"I was recalling my first interest in this specific field and it goes back to my second year in medical college when I worked for a summer in a colony of feebleminded and epileptic in rural Missouri. There were no places then for the epileptic except in with the feebleminded; everybody classed the same. Unfortunately, I am afraid that is often too true today. I was sort of a general assistant in this program and shortly after I had been there one of the patients went into that horrible condition of status epilepticus, having one convulsion after another. Sodium luminal had just come into the country from Germany and I suspect most of you here today are too young to remember the terrible deprivation during the war when no luminal was exported out of Germany and none was manufactured any other place in the world. Epileptics who were dependent upon this drug as their lifeline to prevent seizures went into status and many died.

"Maybe you'll remember that when the first German submarine surfaced off Hampton Roads a number of boxes were brought ashore. They contained precious German anilin dyes and luminal. Well, I asked my chief 'How much shall I give him?' He said 'I don't know. There's no dose on the box. Sit with him and give it to him until the seizure stops or he is dead.' I shall never forget the next 24 hours. This tortured boy on the floor on the mattress and my two assistants, two other inmates, and I started giving sodium luminal hyperdermically every 2 hours. At the end of 24 hours the seizures had stopped. I had given him 120 grains—the average dose being a grain and a half, or two. But he survived and a few weeks later was up and about and just a few years ago I saw this young man still living and still an inmate in the institution.

"I remember, too, in my early days in practice before we had the magnificent anticonvulsive drugs that we do now through research primarily initiated by Dean Merritt, the Chairman of the Professional Advisory Council of the United Epilepsy Association, a wonderful family in St. Louis—three fine girls and one boy, the last of his line—started seizures at the age of seven. He had everything in the world that was known, including bromide, until he couldn't keep his head up and his face broke out in a horrible rash—brain surgery, dehydration diets, allergy tests, everything was tried. And he went on to continue his convulsions, not too often, just often enough to ruin his life and that of his family. Unfortunately, he died in his early twenties before he could benefit by modern research that is available to the one-and-a-half or 2 million epileptics today.

"You know, I like the slogan of this organization, and I think of the understanding that has come from it. This has been a disease of shame in the past. When you wrote your pamphlet under the title, 'The Ghost is Out of the Closet,' that was the beginning of real public understanding. We still have a long way to go. These are wounds that show no scars. I don't think any of us not having been intimately associated with the problem knows what it is like to go through your life perfectly normal most of the time but with the sword of Damocles hanging over your head and not knowing when it was to fall. That is why it has made the problem of the placement of the epileptic in industry so difficult. But enlightened management and enlightened labor, too, have been tremendously helpful in many instances, in doing pilot studies and placing these young people in the jobs which they can do and do well without danger to themselves or to their fellow employees.

"But this is only the beginning. Our only tools to fight this monster—epilepsy—is one through research and there are many, many leads today that lead me to predict that one day we will find the solution to this problem just as we have found the solution to the management of the diabetic, pernicious anemia, and infectious diseases that in the past were thought to be unmanageable and fatal.

"And the second tool is public education and understanding. I need not tell you how important this is for the person with epilepsy. Your association's very excellent public education program is forging the trail for the acceptance of the epileptic in every corner of our Nation and in many distant lands. For without that, although the epileptic can be managed and can live a self-sufficient productive life in dignity, he will find no place to go.

"So I accept this award today with deep gratitude and satisfaction that you feel that the New York Times and I writing for them have had some little part in this great education program that must be a continuing one not only in the United States but all over the world. So again I say my heartfelt gratitude and my deep appreciation to the United Epilepsy Association and to you for coming here today."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an article entitled "NAACP Praised in Integration," written by Luther Jackson, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today. Mr. Jackson, a staff reporter, reports a speech or remarks made yesterday by the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Lawrence E. Walsh, to a religious leadership conference of the President's Conference on Government Contracts.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Outlining the administration's civil rights proposals in the fields of employment, voting, and education, Walsh warned against more liberal measures contained in other bills.

"The other bills are well-intended," he said, "but we must not seek legislation which we know we cannot get."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the newspaper report does not identify "the other bills," and it is possible that the Deputy Attorney General did not specify them. To many of us in Congress it is clear that the civil rights problem is broader in scope and more demanding in nature than the measures proposed by the administration would recognize.

It is regrettable that the second in command of the Department of Justice in the administration would counsel, as he does, that we must not seek legislation which we know we cannot get.

I would ask, first, who knows the answer to the question "What can we get?" until we try, and, second, I would say it counsels we ask only what our opponents may be willing to grant. Progress is not made by this attitude and it is something less than leadership.

I have inquired, and I have been told that the remarks of the Deputy Attorney General were not made from a prepared text. I suspect that all of us on one occasion or another have said things which, when we saw them in print, we realized did not convey the idea we had

in mind. I hope that a correction will be made in this instance if such is the case.

MINNEAPOLIS HIGH SCHOOL RESIDENTIAL SEMINAR ON U.S. FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last month 75 high school students from 60 Minnesota high schools participated in a high school residential seminar on U.S. foreign economic policy in Minneapolis. This was the second annual high school seminar in world affairs sponsored by Macalester College, the center for continuation study of the University of Minnesota, and the Minnesota World Affairs Center. The participants were selected on the basis of their academic ability and achievement, and their deep and genuine interest in world affairs. The final report of the 1959 seminar was prepared under the direction of Dr. Henry Wriston of the American assembly and represents the thinking of these outstanding young people on the military, economic, and technical assistance programs of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA FINAL REPORT OF THE HIGH SCHOOL RESIDENTIAL SEMINAR ON U.S. FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., APRIL 16, 17, AND 18, 1959

(Sponsors: Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota; Macalester College, Minnesota World Affairs Center)

The members of the second High School Residential Seminar on U.S. Foreign Policy wish to express their sense of the value of the seminar discussions, their indebtedness to the distinguished faculty which assisted with factual information and suggestions, and their thanks to the sponsoring institutions and supporting foundations which made the seminar possible.

The topic considered was the military, economic, and technical assistance programs of the United States. We have attempted to determine how these programs contribute to achievement of the objectives of U.S. foreign policy, and to consider the desirability of changes in emphasis or direction. Although we are not in complete agreement we have found a substantial consensus of opinion which supports the following conclusions.

ENDS AND MEANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

1. Objectives of U.S. foreign policy: The continuing object of U.S. policy should be to assure for this and other countries a peaceful international order which permits them to develop their own institutions freely. This requires security from military interventions and territorial aggrandizement. For many countries it requires assistance in economic development which will help to improve standards of living, and thus to reduce dependence upon other states or susceptibility to subversive movements which gather strength by easy promises which cannot be fulfilled. It requires continuous support of those countries which value individual liberty and human dignity and continuous effort to prevent countries which reject these values from attaining a dominant world position, from stifling open channels of trade and communication, or curtailing our freedom of action.

2. The choice of means: The statement of these objectives does not provide an easy guide to policy. The means employed must be consistent with the principles of our free, democratic society. The choice of means must be considered in terms of conflicting interests presented by particular situations, and by our estimate of the relative importance of the claims made. As our capacities are not unlimited priorities must be established. For the present it seems clear that military, economic, and technical assistance are all useful and necessary instruments of policy. However, their utility must be considered with reference to particular countries and areas, which vary in the character of their needs, in their capacity to utilize assistance effectively, and in the value of the contribution they can make to the objectives stated. It follows that the claims which military, economic, and technical assistance make upon the national budget must be considered in the light of a complex experience with many individual problems. In the absence of detailed information we think it right to avoid broad generalizations about increasing one form of aid at the expense of another. We propose that economic aid and technical assistance be increased because we depend upon them for permanent improvement in conditions, but we recognize this can be done only to the extent that our security is not endangered and that such aid can be effectively utilized. We need continuously to review the many factors which enter into our choice of means. This review should certainly include an estimate of any changes in the capabilities or intentions of the Communist states.

3. Means other than assistance programs: The use of other techniques such as diplomacy, defense alliances, development of collective security agencies, cultural relations programs, or propaganda is certainly not excluded by reliance upon aid programs. On the contrary effective diplomacy and information programs are essential to the success of any other programs we undertake. Defensive alliances may provide the framework for effective allocation of military assistance. To the extent that such security devices can be replaced by collective security mechanisms the latter should be preferred. However, the gap between the value systems of Communist and Western states suggests that there is not yet a sufficient community to support collective security at more than regional levels, and in some parts of the world not enough even at the regional level. Cultural relations programs may be useful in gradually extending the perception of mutual interest and shared values.

FOREIGN AID AND COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE

4. Soviet economic growth: We recognize the rapid growth of Soviet economic power and the capacity to use this power as a weapon of foreign policy. This results from a rigid political control of the Soviet economy which enables Russia to exploit labor and to hold the production of consumer goods to subsistence levels, thus in effect converting labor into capital growth. The same course may be expected in Communist China. Such a system permits concentration of effort narrowly upon development of heavy industry, production of military goods, and technical development. Resources can be diverted at will to meet special requirements. The system has achieved controlled power in the hands of the government, which thus has become a serious threat to free nations. This impressive growth of power has also had great propaganda value in countries where government leadership is weak and poverty is general. Yet Soviet power has been achieved at the expense of the standard of living of the Russian general public, and it has deliberately milked the economies of satellite states. It is not a system which the United States or other free states which have a concern for the well-being of their citizens would care to imitate. Our problem is to continue our open economy which favors individual enterprise and consumer benefits, yet to achieve the voluntary concentration of strength and purpose which will enable our Government to meet the Communist threat.

5. Soviet economic aid: The concentration of political and economic power in the hands of the Soviet Government has enabled it to give economic assistance to underdeveloped countries and to pinpoint this aid at times when and in places where dramatic effects can be produced and the propaganda value of the effort will be great. Governmental control in the hands of a small party elite has permitted rapid decisions and adjustments to meet special circumstances. Our own elaborate and slow governmental process has sometimes presented a contrast which has impressed recipient states unfavorably, despite the far more substantial character of our aid programs. Whereas the Soviets can exploit fully the propaganda possibilities of their gifts or loans and make every effort to do so at the local and personal level, we sometimes make grants only after invidious public discussions of the desirability of doing so and thus arouse doubts concerning our attitudes or motives. The Soviets have cultivated the impression that no strings are attached to their aid. In a formal sense this may have been true, yet the aid has been used to open a backdoor for Soviet influence through technical advisers, propaganda, and close economic ties. We have sought primarily the assurance of productive employment of grants and loans. Yet we have created the impression that our aid is restricted to countries which support us in the cold war or even to those willing to accept defensive alliances, and we have failed to quiet the fears inspired in underdeveloped countries by Communist propaganda that our aid cloaks imperialist designs.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE POLICY

6. Graduated deterrence; massive retaliation: U.S. policy with respect to military assistance, bases, and alliances is purely defensive in purpose. It must depend upon the types of military action which can reasonably be anticipated and their relationship to our security and to the preservation of the free world. The experience of the past decade suggests the probability of military incidents on widely dispersed fronts deliberately provoked to probe the defensive temper of the free world, which can be contained as limited wars by prompt, energetic action. Our interest in dealing with such incidents as limited wars is apparent. Not to meet and suppress such attacks as they occur might result in the passing of free countries under Communist control and the weakening of the will of other free nations to resist. But to meet limited and exploratory attacks by force far greater than is required to contain them might invite major nuclear welfare. Widely dispersed forces of varied character which can apply graduated deterrents proportioned to the magnitude and character of the attack seem to be necessary for the conduct of such limited wars. On the other hand deterrence against all-out nuclear attack must depend upon the capacity and will to reply in kind.

We have considered the question whether capacity for massive retaliation by use of nuclear weapons would in itself suffice as a deterrent to "brush fire" wars without the maintenance of an elaborate set of alliances and oversea military establishments. Such a sole reliance upon major nuclear weapons by the development of a kind of nuclear "fortress America" of missiles and aircraft based here seems to us to overlook the fact that deterrence would depend not merely upon capacity for massive retaliation but also upon the will to use that capacity and

upon our success in convincing the Soviets of our intention to use it. We believe the people of the United States would never sanction the use of a major nuclear attack in response to a minor military probe in a remote country, and that the Soviets know this as well as we. Consequently we feel that the only deterrents likely to be effective in restraining limited wars are of the graduated variety. Although we realize that the provision of such deterrents throughout the world imposes a great financial burden and involves us in many incidental problems we see no escape from it.

7. Defensive alliances: Our defensive alliances differ in the degree to which they have been implemented by joint military forces in being. In some cases they are bilateral, in others multilateral. In the case of NATO and OAS they may rest upon a firmer political consensus than in the case of SEATO. The Baghdad Pact, with which we are associated, rests upon no consensus of the Arab World and therefore projects us into problems we might prefer to avoid. All these arrangements, as well as those with Australia and New Zealand, with Nationalist China, with Japan, and with Korea, must be separately weighed in terms of the kind of threat presented in the area concerned. We can hardly suppose that all of these pacts are equally necessary or useful, but we believe all of them have some utility. At the least they serve as a declaration of joint purpose, an assurance of a unified military front. They may provide a framework for consultation, military planning, and acquisition of oversea bases. They give such assurance as we can obtain that military assistance will be applied to purposes useful to the free world. In some cases they permit the organization of joint staffs, the procurement of uniform weapons and supplies, and joint training and exercises. Althought they project us into political problems we might otherwise avoid this seems a necessary price to be paid for these advantages. We can only seek the form of political agreement which in each case seems best calculated to assure the desired results. In some cases we have found it necessary to make direct commitments of military manpower in oversea bases in order to make our involvement physically apparent. Elsewhere we find it necessary to provide military equipment in large quantities and training cadres; by doing so we utilize the manpower of other nations in the defense of the free world and reduce the demands upon our own. Where feasible it should, of course, be our aim to move increasingly toward economic aid, some of which may be used by the recipients to develop production of their own military equipment.

POLICY FOR ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

8. Purposes of economic and technical assistance: It can be said that the object of economic and technical assistance is defense, if by the latter term we mean the preservation of a world in which nations have self-determination and open communication and competition. Certainly we must include in our objectives a stabilized international trade and must seek to avoid a situation in which controlled economies may be used deliberately to disrupt foreign trade. Except for emergency aid to meet conditions of famine and distress we need not think of our purposes as simply humanitarian, although the humanitarian impulses of our people may bring them support. Our Government can properly proceed from motives of enlightened self-interest, in the conviction that economic stability and progress in other countries will be the best insurance against disruption of the free world and consequent danger to our own institutions.

We need to make our purposes clear, perhaps as much to ourselves as to others, so that directness in administration and single-mindedness as to policy are encouraged. If we can make our objects clear we need not doubt that they will compare favorably with those of the Soviets in the view of recipient states.

9. The recipients of aid: The basic test of entitlement to economic aid or technical assistance should be need and the capacity to utilize the aid effectively in development programs. The fact that a state is considered neutralist with respect to the cold war should certainly not be a bar. Neutralism usually reflects a desire for independence and avoidance of involvement in struggles which might delay internal development. If economic aid can assist a country in these objects the result must be gratifying to the United States, for it will contribute to the spread of free institutions. It may even be that aid can properly be given to Communist states where there is reason to think that it will strengthen their independence from Russian control. We have already adopted this policy with respect to Yugoslavia and Poland. Of course we should avoid assistance to countries which would turn the aid to the support of institutions we seek to combat. Every case will need to be considered individually from this point of view, and we must expect to have some hard choices. For example, there are underdeveloped countries which are not communistic but are controlled by corrupt or despotic governments. We have here to weigh the desirability of helping economic development against the danger of strengthening such regimes.

10. The extent of aid: The amount of aid given to a particular country must be determined by its capacity to put it to productive uses without rapid inflation. In relatively primitive countries caution must also be observed not to build a complex economy faster than the limits of cultural adaptation. A strong economy in the hands of an inept, corrupt, or benighted government is hardly a contribution to free institutions. These facts suggest that technical assistance and development programs for underdeveloped countries should be kept in balance with programs of cultural exchange, literacy, training of teachers, and the like, and that substantial appropriations will be required for these purposes.

From the standpoint of the United States there are also limits to the amount of aid which can be given, but we think these limits have not been reached. It is probable that from $2 to $3 billion could be usefully devoted annually to economic aid and technical assistance. Sound distribution of this total would of course require careful consideration in administering the program, and the possibility of limiting the amounts spent should be frequently reviewed. The present contribution of about $1½ billion by the United States does not tax our capacity. An expanded program is desirable.

11. Kinds of aid: The types of aid and proper proportions of each type must be decided individually for each country. Underdeveloped countries are usually in need of technical assistance and long-range development capital. In most instances, they are not appropriate recipients of large-scale military assistance. Other countries will require economic and military aid in varying proportions. In the sense of overall policy the United States will probably not find it practicable to reduce military assistance significantly at present, although it seems desirable to reduce it relatively by increasing the programs of economic and technical assistance.

12. Conditions attached to aid: There should be no political or military conditions attached to eligibility to receive economic aid or technical assistance. In view of the false impressions already current on this point a clear disclaimer of such requirements is needed. Perhaps a direct congressional prohibition of such conditions would be useful, as would a skillful information program designed to combat the misapprehensions created by Communist propaganda.

Economic conditions are valid only to the extent that they relate to employment of the aid for productive projects. Aid should not be given for projects which do not contribute to economic development, and aid programs should be reviewed to see that there is no diversion of funds to unauthorized purposes. Any other type of economic condition would not be compatible with our own purpose.

13. Trade versus aid: It is desirable as far as possible to avoid keeping underdeveloped States in the condition of pensioners. For this reason we should move toward long-term low-interest loans and toward such modification of our restrictions upon trade as will enable them to export to us and thus to pay the loans. This will help to produce stabilized economies which will be able to present more inviting opportunities for private investment. Direct grants are in many cases now necessary, but we must find ways to move to bilateral relationships which avoid such direct dependence and provide permanently viable economic arrangements.

14. Surpluses and dumping: A factor which often disrupts international markets is the disposition of States having large agricultural surpluses to dump them upon the world market, thus depressing prices. Some countries, including the United States, encourage such surpluses by artificial price supports designed to improve the relative economic position of farmers. Where famine exists in other countries there is indeed reason to relieve it by making such surpluses available, but this should be done in a way which will minimize effects upon the market. The free gift of surplus crops to another government or selling below the world market will produce difficulties. Grants to enable such governments to buy at market prices would be more satisfactory. Perhaps an international agreement could be reached among the surplus-producing countries either to reduce surpluses or to determine their disposition. An international crop bank might be a possible solution.

15. Bilateral versus multilateral aid programs: In the case of underdeveloped countries we could avoid distrust of our motives by channeling economic aid and technical assistance more heavily through international agencies. Such agencies can also draw upon a wider pool of technical experts available for missions. Such a redirection might well be proposed first upon condition that the Soviet Union follow the same course, but we might find it advantageous to move in this direction even if they refuse. The usefulness of regional planning and administration has also been demonstrated in the Colombo plan and in Latin America.

However, we do not suggest that a single pattern of multilateral aid would serve our purpose. Bilateral programs of economic aid may be more appropriate in the case of countries having developed economies, since these have less fear of imperialism. Certainly we should deal directly with allies where mixed programs of military and economic assistance are used. Even a complete channeling of economic aid through international agencies would seem undesirable. In some cases a greater proportion of our contribution might go to states we considered to be poor risks. Furthermore, the anonymity of international administration would tend to obscure the large contribution and laudable purposes of the United States. There are cases in which direct aid can work to our advantage. Therefore, we must again consider the cases individually and resolve them on the basis of the factors peculiar to each.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 94) to defer the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1960 crop of wheat until June 1, 1959.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5916) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. BOW, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1559) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, June 1859, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business in the morning hour? If not, the morning hour is concluded.

Mr. MOSS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAN LUIS UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, Calif., to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on behalf of himself and the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD disclose the facts surrounding what we here try to do. First of all, the able Senator from Illinois has suggested that the authorization called for by our bill is not a $290 million one, but that it is open-ended and that it will involve untold additional millions. I deny it.

All I can do, Mr. President, besides deny that assertion, is to point to the printed hearing on the proposed legislation before the Senate, and most particularly to page 78 of that hearing, in which Mr. Goodrich Lineweaver, of the staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in a memorandum to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who was chairman of the subcommittee, stated, in part:

> 1. The authorization for appropriations in section 6 of the bill is $290,430,000.
>
> 2. Included in this total of $290,430,000 are: (a) $10,814,000 for footings and other facilities of San Luis Dam, whereby the capacity may be increased from 1 million acre-feet to 2,001,000 acre-feet (i) if the State comes into the project, or (ii) if the service area of the San Luis project is extended to the Avanol Gap area in the southern San Joaquin Valley;
>
> (b) Four million dollars for additional capacity or facilities at the Tracy pumping plant, under either of the conditions mentioned in (a); and
>
> (c) Two million eight hundred and eighty-seven dollars for San Luis modifications in the event the enlargement project is developed.
>
> The total of these figures provided for in the $290,430,000 authorization for appropriations is $17,701,000.
>
> 3. This $290,430,000 appears to be an absolute limitation so far as the facilities mentioned with the respective amounts estimated. Any additional facilities, such as further enlargement of existing canals or additional canals would require reauthorization by the Congress. It is estimated that in event the State project comes in an additional $5 to $8 million would be required to finance extra outlet capacity in the dam.

I regret that the Senator from Illinois is not now present in the Chamber. I intend to bring this matter to his attention when he returns.

Mr. President, I observe my friend, the Senator from Oregon, is present in the Chamber. I now observe the Senator from Illinois entering the Chamber. I will repeat what I said.

It is easy, Mr. President, for a Senator in good faith to make a startling charge, without proof and have that charge reiterated outside this hall until finally some believe that perhaps there may be merit to the charge. I said earlier that with respect to the charge of the Senator from Illinois as to what amount is intended to be authorized for appropriation in the bill, it is $290,430,000. The Senator from Illinois has said again and again that this is not so, and that the proposed legislation would authorize much more than that amount to be appropriated.

I repeat, Mr. President, my denial of that statement. I deny the charge of the Senator from Illinois. Moreover, I point to page 78 of the hearings on the bill and call attention to the statement not of one of the authors of the bill, but of a staff member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in the memorandum which he prepared for the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is chairman of the subcommittee.

This is all I can do by way of refuting the charge of the Senator from Illinois, which is not a fact, so I repeat the language:

> This $290,430,000 appears to be an absolute limitation so far as the facilities mentioned with the respective amounts estimated. Any additional facilities, such as further enlargement of existing canals or additional canals would require reauthorization by the Congress. It is estimated that in event the State project comes in an additional $5 to $8 million would be required to finance extra outlet capacity in the dam.

Mr. President, basically there is a good faith dispute in this Chamber as to what ought to be done by way of applying or not applying Federal reclamation law in its entirety to the projected Feather River project of the people and of the government of California. And some here believe that, whether the amendment carries or not, Federal reclamation law will not, as it should not, apply to the State projects merely because of joint use of San Luis.

Mr. President, there are reclamation projects in almost all the Western States of America. The United States has been generous with California. In the State of my friend from Oregon, the Government of the United States has invested money, to be repaid as the Federal laws apply, in great reclamation projects. I say to my friend from Oregon, and I know he will agree, there never has been in the history of reclamation legislation one instance in which the Federal Government has sought to make any State comply with Federal law in State water projects.

I believe in the Federal reclamation law. I believe it ought to be upheld. I believe when Federal reclamation projects are undertaken with money from the Government of the United States, Federal reclamation law ought to apply.

But I also believe that if the State of Ohio, the State of Virginia, the State of Louisiana, the State of Illinois, the State of Wyoming, the State of Oregon, or the State of California desires to bond itself, to borrow money and to construct its own State water system, the Federal Government ought not tell the State the Federal reclamation law must apply.

I desire to refer again to the hearings with respect to the San Luis unit, which are on our desks. Gov. Pat Brown came to Washington, and testified before my committee in the Senate and the similar

committee of the House of Representatives in favor of the proposed legislation. I do not need to spend any time observing that Governor Brown and I belong to different political parties. Governor Brown is in favor of the proposed legislation. Governor Brown stated to the members of my committee, Mr. President:

The third point I wish to call to your attention with special force and all of the clarity that I can command is that the State itself is launching an unprecedented water development program of its own. We know that we cannot and should not depend entirely on the Federal Government. I hope and expect that the State of California will commit itself to invest more than $11 billion in the next 25 years over and above the Federal programs to insure adequate statewide water development. The State is now in the process of earmarking a $190 million investment fund for these purposes.

And I might add that this investment fund is money that was received from offshore oil reserves in bonus bidding and royalties that we already achieved. So one natural resource, oil, will now be committed to water, if I am successful in my program.

I am sure that the voters will approve a bond issue and I intend and I know that I will get bipartisan support in this—this bond issue which will finance the remainder of the cost. Future generations that will achieve the benefits will share in the repayment of those bonds.

No State has ever launched so great a water program. California recognizes, however, that it cannot do the job alone. The joint venture at San Luis represents, I believe, the best possible example of a proper method for Federal-State action in water resource development.

Thus the bill was fashioned in a way which received the complete, unequivocal approval of the Governor of California and of the various public agencies and conservancy districts north, south, and central in my State. Today it is fair and accurate to say that the people of California are quite united in their earnest petition to the Congress of their country to pass this proposed legislation.

The Federal Government, through the Bureau of the Budget, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior, has placed its stamp of approval on the pending legislation.

Here is one State in America which has within two of its great valleys a Federal reclamation project called the Central Valley project, where Federal reclamation law applies as it should apply.

Alongside it, and somewhat longer, when it is completed, will be the State of California water project. It will transport northern surplus water into the parched areas of southern California, along the way assisting all other areas of the State, until finally, $11 billion will have been contributed by the people of California to its ultimate and complete construction.

In the process of bringing northern water into the southernmost reaches of our State it is necessary, so the State engineers tell us, to construct a storage dam, into which northern surplus waters would be carried, and from which such surplus waters as might be required would be taken from there south. But the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior want to give greater service in the Central Valley area, and so they want the service area of the Central Valley project enlarged. For that purpose the Federal Government requires the construction of a storage dam.

The unhappy fact is that there is only one reservoir site available. The Federal engineers say so. The State engineers say so. If there were two reservoir sites available, the State of California could utilize one, and no one would raise any question as to what law should apply. The State law would apply.

The Federal Government could use the other dam site, if there were two, and no one would raise a question as to what law should apply with respect to the reservoir constructed by the Federal Government. Federal reclamation laws would apply. But because there is only one site, I think it is to the credit of the State and the Federal Government that, acting through their engineers and also through their policymakers, they have reached an agreement by which one reservoir site will be utilized for both systems—first, the Central Valley project system now in being, and second, the State of California Feather River project, which is in prospect. For that reason the reservoir would double the capacity which would otherwise be available.

It was at that point in the agreement between the State and the Federal Government that section 6(a) was written into the bill. The same section was in the bill last year, when Senator KNOWLAND and I introduced it. My friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made the same argument a year ago. He was joined by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but the Senate saw fit to repudiate their position, and passed the bill.

As I say, the section with respect to what law should apply, which was in the bill in the last Congress, is now in the bill before us. It is section 6(a). Let me read it again:

SEC. 6. (a) The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956.

What is meant by that language? I think the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs describes it in a rather clear and pithy fashion. Let me read what the report states on that point. On page 8 of the report the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs says:

The position of the committee is that the Federal reclamation law with respect to acreage limitations should apply only to lands under contract with the United States.

I have said in the Senate and in my State many times that the people of California are indebted to the Federal Government. The Central Valley project represents the difference between economic life and death in the two central valleys. In southern California, where my home is, we are indebted to the great Hoover Dam, which was fought through the Senate years ago by the late great Hiram W. Johnson, a magnificent Senator and a courageous leader in my political party, who fought against tremendous odds in order finally to win approval by the Senate, and thereafter by the House of Representatives, of a gigantic multipurpose structure which today brings water and hydroelectric power into almost every area of southern California.

However, at times in the past the people of my State have had some difficulty in dealing with representatives of the Federal Government, and there have been some unhappy chapters in the history of that relationship. Senators on the other side of the aisle will remember one of my predecessors, Senator Sheridan Downey, a Democrat, who had quite a stormy battle with the Bureau of Reclamation 15 or 20 years ago. I believe that is the reason why this bill contains a statement as to where Federal law should apply and where State law should apply, in order to eliminate the last possible objection which someone might raise at some time against allowing the State to operate its own system the way it desires.

For example, I quote from page 71 of the hearings, in a statement prepared by Warren Butler, vice chairman and a member of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. This is a great public agency whose responsibility it is to bring water for domestic purposes into the homes of my city and of most of the other communities in southern California. By way of description of the bill I quote from what he had to say at page 71 of the hearings:

As a measure to increase confidence and avoid misunderstanding, the language of section 7 of S. 1887 of the last congressional session would be restored, so that the point at which Federal laws will cease to apply and State laws will prevail is clearly and unmistakably set forth. In view of the confusion which now exists in many fields over the applicability of Federal and State laws, we think this provision would greatly increase the confidence of our people in the legislation.

Let me say parenthetically, gentlemen, that our concern south of the Tehatchapie does not involve this 160-acre limitation as it does north of the Tehatchapie. What we are concerned about is like the man who has two bosses. Sometimes he does not know what to do. If you only have one, then you have a situation that is easier to work with.

In a similar vein, I should like to read into the RECORD the text of a telegram which I have received from Stanley W. Kronick. Mr. Kronick is a California lawyer. He has been honored by Gov. Pat Brown with appointment to a position of civic responsibility in the government of my State. This is what he says:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
May 9, 1959.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge that section 6(a) remain in S. 44. Its inclusion was agreed to by all interests in the State of California, including the State itself and the congressional representatives from the affected areas. The reasons were (1) that Federal law should

not control water deliveries by the State from the joint Federal-State project, and (2) that this should be made so clear by the Congress that a contrary argument could not later be made.

The reason Federal reclamation law should not control water deliveries by the State is because the State will contribute its proportionate share of the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of the joint-used facilities of the project. Federal law should no more apply to proportionate State use of the joint-used facilities than to State use of projects financed and constructed solely by the State.

Section 6(a) was included because it was recognized that in the absence of a clear expression of congressional intent and strong contrary argument might be made, somewhat as follows: Since the proposed San Luis project will be financed partially with Federal funds, the complete joint Federal-State facilities could not have been constructed without the Federal investment. The Federal investment therefore to some extent makes the State water deliveries possible, and as a consequence Federal law applies to such deliveries.

By setting forth this argument, I do not mean to imply that it would necessarily prevail in the courts. But the argument is substantial enough to make it advisable in any event to preclude it by express statutory language. The effort now being made on the Senate floor to delete section 6(a) by those who intend thereby that the Federal acreage limitation will apply to water deliveries by the State is further support that the California interests were right in clarifying the matter by the inclusion of section 6(a).

If section 6(a) is deleted now as a result of the insistence of those who state flatly that they want Federal law to apply to water deliveries by the State, this legislative history might be almost conclusive as to the intent of the Congress that Federal law is to apply to such deliveries. Logically, the only valid argument for deletion of section 6(a) is that Federal law should control water service by the State. To prevent that result it is now plainly imperative that section 6(a) remain in the bill. In the light of the current debate on the Senate floor, I see no other way to accomplish what all the State interests believe is fair and just—that State law shall govern State water delivery.

STANLEY W. KRONICK.

Mr. President, I believe that all of us can be given credit for trying to represent the best interests of our State.

When my friend from Illinois introduced proposed legislation to have the great city of Chicago receive water from one of the Great Lakes, Lake Michigan, he was representing, as he saw the light, the best interests of the State of Illinois. The fact that our great neighbor to the north, Canada, interposed objections, however sound they may have been, did not dissuade the Senator from Illinois from doing that which the people of his State would, I suppose, want him to do, to stand on the floor of the Senate and in good faith try to obtain more water from Lake Michigan for the great city of Chicago in Illinois.

The fact that the State of Michigan opposed what the Senator from Illinois was trying to do should, I think, be quite irrelevant in judging whether or not my friend from Illinois hewed to the line of the public interest of the people he represents.

It is not for me to say that my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was right or wrong with respect to the position he took on the Federal reclamation projects in the State of Oregon. I do not know what the situation is in the State of Oregon. I do know that in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs charges have been made that a great many landowners in Oregon have waxed wealthy and fat from Federal reclamation projects. But I am certain that if that were the case, it would have the earnest attention of the senior Senator from Oregon.

On the floor of the Senate today, a Democratic Senator and a Republican Senator from California are simply asking in good faith that Congress approve what the Federal agencies involved have already approved, namely, a means whereby waters originating in California can be saved and put to beneficial use. Every year, 3 million acre-feet of water flow from California into the Pacific Ocean, and are lost forever. Here is an opportunity for a generous and a far-sighted Congress to demonstrate once again that when the public interest is at stake, it will respond and will do that which it ought to do, and which it always has done, with respect to water problems in whatever part of the country may be involved.

There is one more thing I wish to say in this argument. I say most respectfully that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois have offered an amendment which, in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, will apply Federal reclamation law to all the waters which enter the dam which is authorized to be constructed by the bill.

I asked the Senator from Illinois if he meant that such an intention on his part would apply to the waters before they flowed into the reservoir. The RECORD does not disclose that the Senator from Illinois answered my question. I think it is fair to say that if the Senator from Illinois were correct in the position he takes as to the intention of his amendment, it would mean that Federal reclamation law would apply to waters of the State system south of the reservoir provided for in the bill, but that waters north of the San Luis Reservoir would not be subjected to Federal law.

Is that not a mockery? Is that not a perfectly ridiculous thing to attempt to wreak on 14 million people? Would it not provoke sheer deviltry in what the Governor of my State, the legislature of my State, and the water districts of my State are trying to do? Of course it would.

If there is a misguided belief that the Senate will be doing something constructive if it votes for the Douglas-Morse amendment, I beg and pray that Senators take another look at it and read the RECORD again. Replete in the last 3 days of speechmaking are repeated charges that large landowners will receive a windfall. All I can say again is that the elected representatives of the people, both from the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, and from a Democratic State administration and a Republican national administration, have joined together in urging that this proposed legislation be passed.

I say in all sincerity that however much in good faith the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon unquestionably are acting, they are wrong, wrong, wrong in their understanding of the needs and the plight of California, and of what, in good faith, working together, the Federal Government and the State government will be able, in the instance of the San Luis joint-use reservoir, to do.

I earnestly hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I believe the senior Senator from California, the junior Senator from California, the people of California, and the courts which may interpret the legislative intent concerning the bill would like to have this statement in the RECORD. The junior Senator from Colorado does not agree with the statements made by the senior Senator from California that inherent in the Douglas amendment is the construction which has just been placed upon it, for the reason which I stated yesterday in debate. So far as I am concerned—and I think it could be easily construed by a court examining this RECORD—that is not the intent of the Douglas amendment. If such were the intent, I might change my position.

I take the position, for the purpose of this RECORD, which might be reviewed by a court, that the objective of the amendment is to insure the preservation of the Federal reclamation laws. That is the interpretation of the junior Senator from Colorado.

My second interpretation is that the amendment does not interfere with waters which arise within California and are under the jurisdiction of California. It does not confer Federal jurisdiction over those waters. I think inherent in the amendment, as the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has pointed out, to use again his phraseology, are what we call objective facts which may be determined by a court because of the commingling of the waters.

I say this only for the purpose of keeping the RECORD straight, because very easily this matter could be taken into court. I know the distinguished senior Senator from California does not in any way want to injure the validity of this project or the principles which he has announced in behalf of it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the comment of the able Senator from Colorado. I must say that the RECORD will be helped because he has so spoken.

I say to him very frankly that I violently disagree with what the Senator from Illinois has said on the floor of the Senate his amendment will accomplish. I am certain the Senator from Colorado joins me in that disagreement. The Senator from Illinois, if I can quote him correctly, has stated several times that if his amendment shall be adopted, it will mean that Federal reclamation law shall apply to all waters which flow from the joint use reservoir, whether they go into the State system, paid for by the people of the State, or not. I deny that

contention. I take it from what the Senator from Colorado has said that he, too, denies it. I take it that I have correctly quoted the Senator from Illinois, generally speaking, concerning the intention with which his amendment has been offered.

But I must say there is merit in the position of the telegram sent by a California lawyer, which I read, that some persons could argue in a judicial proceeding that if at this late date section 6(a) were stricken from the bill it would constitute an intention on the part of the Senate to make Federal law apply, as the Senator from Illinois would say, and as the Senator from Colorado would deny.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the very point of my closing statement on this matter. I think whoever reads the RECORD should understand that there is no perfect unanimity of opinion and, therefore, no clear legislative intent concerning this question.

As I understand the argument made by the senior Senator from Illinois, I think there is considerable merit to his position, but I do not interpret it to be so all destructive and all conclusive as the interpretation placed upon it by the senior Senator from California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I had intended to answer this point in my speech this afternoon; but it is a fact that the Senator from Colorado has hit the nail on the head today with regard to the legal aspects of the matter, so I want to answer the question now.

The lawyer who sent the Senator from California the telegram which he read, has not, in my judgment, read the record of this debate, because I think the conclusion which the lawyer reached in his telegram is highly erroneous.

Let me state again that nothing the Senator from Illinois and the two Senators from Oregon could say in this debate could possibly change existing reclamation law. Existing reclamation law is not changed by debate on the floor of the Senate. To the contrary, Mr. President, what we fear is—and we are satisfied it is true—that if section 6(a) remains in the bill, existing reclamation law will be changed, and will be changed against the interest of the public. So we are going to do everything we can to try to persuade the Senate to delete section 6(a).

Let me state the situation as I believe it to be: With section 6(a) out of the bill, the Federal reclamation laws will remain unchanged. Then it will be for the courts to determine to what extent, if any, the Federal reclamation laws apply to the various phases of the San Luis project.

But I say most respectfully that what the two Senators from California have been trying to do is to make a record around section 6(a), so that if it does remain in the bill, then that record will be used by the courts as the basis for a finding that it was the intention of the Senate that the reclamation laws should be modified. The legal proposition is just that simple.

If the senior Senator from California and the junior Senator from California do not think section 6(a) changes the existing reclamation laws, why do not they agree to elminate it?

On the other hand, the fact that they have persistently insisted that section 6(a) remain in the bill is an admission of the accuracy of our case, namely, that what they are trying to do by means of a project bill is to amend the reclamation laws.

If they believe the reclamation laws should be amended, let them come forward with a clean bill which would do just that. I happen to think that the reclamation laws should be amended in some particulars, although I do not think the particular amendment the Senators from California are proposing should be agreed to. But if the Senators from California believe the reclamation laws should be amended, let them come forward with a separate bill to that effect; and perhaps it would be one on which we would like to help them.

But so long as they insist on keeping section 6(a) in the pending bill, and so long as it is our opinion that section 6(a) has the effect of modifying the reclamation laws, we are going to try to get section 6(a) deleted from the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Oregon is wrong. I am sure he will agree that the Senate and House of Representatives can, if they wish, either extend reclamation law over non-Federal projects in California simply because one reservoir is jointly used; or they can do exactly the reverse, if they wish to do so.

There is nothing secret about what we have sought to do. As I previously stated, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs went on to say, at the time when the bill was reported favorably:

> The position of the committee is that the Federal reclamation law with respect to acreage limitations should apply only to lands under contract with the United States.

What is the matter with that? If one contracts with the State of Idaho for water, he should be subjected to the laws of the State of Idaho.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. In a moment.

Mr. President, if one contracts for water with the State of California, he should be subjected to the laws of the State of California.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. So, Mr. President, I maintain that it is simply ridiculous to allege that here in the Senate we are trying to change reclamation law. The Senate can change reclamation law if it wishes to do so. A proposal to amend the reclamation law would originate in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that is the committee which reported the pending bill; and in writing the bill, the committee tried to indicate where Federal law would apply and where it wanted State law to apply.

Mr. President, I remember, in my first year in the Senate, the extensive debate which involved the tidelands. Do you remember that debate, Mr. President? I do not know whether the people of Michigan had then honored you with public service. That was a notable and long debate.

I am inclined to believe that back of the recommendation by some public agencies in California that section 6(a) be included in the bill was a thought about something like the tidelands controversy. I remember when some of the farmers in the Central Valley were bludgeoned and punished by representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation, and they looked to a Democratic Senator for assistance.

So here is an honest attempt to eliminate any contention, however tenuous, that Federal law should apply to the State system simply and solely by reason of the joint use of this project.

Now I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to speak in my own time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, Mr. President, if my friend would like to proceed in that way, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am sorry my friend, the Senator from California, seems to be leaving the floor, because I want to deal with several questions of fact which he raised earlier today and also yesterday.

My good friend, the senior Senator from California, accused me of making a misstatement as regards the amount of additional Federal money authorized by this bill.

All of us know that there has already been authorized for the Central Valley project approximately $860 million, of which $630 million has been expended.

In section 7, in the first sentence, we find the following:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of $290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes.

Note that this sentence expressly states that this $290 million is authorized for "the works of the San Luis unit other than distribution systems and drains."

The Senator from California says that is all that is authorized in the bill, and that the additional $190 million which I have mentioned has been conjured up by me, and does not exist in reality.

But I call his attention and the attention of the Senate to the fact that the sentence I have just read is followed by another sentence, namely—

> There are also authorized to be appropriated—

Mr. President, let us remember those words—

> in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests.

So in the second sentence of section 7, there is an additional authorization.

And in the committee report, we find the following statement on page 10:

In addition to the main water supply features the San Luis area would require distribution systems, drains, and some deep wells.

In other words, the identical types of work for which additional authorizations are made in the sentence I previously read.

Then we find this:

The estimated cost of these works is $192,650,000.

So the figure I gave—namely, $480 million—is correct, and, indeed, is a slight understatement; as a matter of fact, the amount thus authorized would be approximately $483 million. So that the Senator from California, in his anxiety to convict me of a misstatement, had not read either the bill or the report as carefully as he should have.

Now let me deal with the second question of fact. Yesterday the Senator from California said that I was wrong in my interpretation of the legislation relating to the dam at Pine Flat and the opinion of the Attorney General relative thereto. I had said that the provisions of the Federal reclamation law had been held to apply in the Pine Flat case. The Senator from California questioned that contention.

I put into the RECORD, without reading it, an opinion from the present Attorney General, Mr. William P. Rogers, dated December 15, 1958, and given to the Secretary of the Interior. Those who wish to study this statement will find the opinion on pages 7862–7863 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I read a few sentences from that opinion:

The expression of intention that the reclamation laws apply to projects such as are here involved appears too strongly in the legislative history of section 8 to permit its frustration by virtue of any implication which might be drawn from section 10.

For these reasons, I conclude that section 8 makes the reclamation laws applicable to contracts for the disposition of irrigation benefits from dams and reservoirs constructed under the authority of section 10, even if no additional works are required to be constructed in order to make such irrigation benefits available.

In other words, the mere fact that the construction was to be in the hands of the Army Engineers did not remove the provisions of the reclamation laws from applying to the land thus irrigated.

Mr. President, with those two questions of fact cleared up, and the contentions of the Senator from California having been proved to be in error, let me pass, if I may, to one or two other points.

I do not desire to spend too much time on the question of whose waters are involved in the proposed San Luis project.

It is true, I think, that virtually all the water of the Sacramento Valley originates inside the State of California; but the State of California did not provide the vast funds for utilizing those waters. It called on the Federal Government for aid. The Federal Government will be committed, if this bill goes through, to spend $1,300 million.

It is our contention that when the Federal Government constructs facilities, and when the States come to the Federal Government and ask for money for those facilities, the provisions of the Federal laws should apply to the disposition of the water thus impounded and distributed upon the land which is irrigated.

I will not continue to labor the point that the initial block of some 440,000 acres will all be irrigated by facilities constructed wholly by the Federal Government. That is obvious.

But I should like to emphasize that the so-called second block of 500,000 acres which is designated by the Senators from California as a "State service area" is, in reality, no such thing.

That land will be irrigated by joint facilities: A dam jointly constructed by the State and Federal Governments; a reservoir jointly filled; the Cross Delta Channel, which has been entirely financed by the Federal Government; water that will also be lifted from the Sacramento Valley into the San Joaquin Valley by power supplied largely by Federal dams and power stations upstream.

The new Oroville Dam will probably be constructed in substantial part by Federal funds. Interest-free Federal loans will be sought by the so-called State irrigators.

The whole complex in the Central Valley which has been federally financed is essential for this added amount of water; and it is obvious that the water and the facilities will be commingled; and, being commingled, Federal reclamation laws should prevail.

That is a rough outline of the physical situation. But, of course, the human stake is very great. The question is whether the water is to be put on giant estates for the benefit of the owners of those giant estates, giving them windfalls of tens of millions of dollars, and, in the aggregate, hundreds of millions of dollars, or whether the water shall be used to democratize the use of the land in accordance with democratic landownership policies.

That is the issue. We cannot escape it.

The State of California has no acreage limitation law. If the Federal reclamation law is ruled not to apply to the second block of land—and that is the express effect of the provisions of section 6(a)—then we can be certain that if and when water is put on the second block of land, it will be put on land owned by the large landholders.

The State of California, as I have said, has no acreage limitation. I think it is extremely doubtful that it will enact a law imposing such limitation. In effect, we are being asked to give up the protection which Federal reclamation law already provides for an illusory protection which, in all probability, will not be furnished.

I think the debates which have been going on for almost a week have clarified people's minds on this subject.

I should like to read into the RECORD telegrams which have been coming in from California.

I should like to read first a telegram from Clovis, Calif., addressed to me:

CLOVIS, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to add my name in support of your stand on the 160-acre limitation. I am farming with my father and brother on our 100-acre cotton and dairy farm in Fresno, Calif. We are proud that we are growing quality products and at a decreasing cost to our consumers. The San Luis project without an acreage limitation allows large scale farms to grow products at a price which we cannot compete against. The limitations means that we small farmers can continue to operate and many of us will have an opportunity to buy land in the fertile San Luis project area.

Sincerely,

ALBERT NIEPO.

He is not a large landowner, but apparently he is an industrious and hard-working citizen of California, who sees what is coming.

Another telegram addressed to me reads as follows:

CLOVIS, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We favor the reclamation policy of wide distribution of resources and benefits. Our studies led us to conclude that acreage limitation is essential to the preservation of family-size farms and should apply to State service areas. Therefore we heartily endorse the Douglas-Morse amendment to the San Luis bill.

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF FRESNO,
V. COLVER,
J. DUBISCH,
E. HALL,
C. MARICA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining telegrams which I have received be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, and yourself on your great fight to preserve acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law. Our membership of 200 precinct-working Democrats urges your continued effort to delete section 6(a) and other objectionable provisions from S. 44, San Luis project.

JOHN S. PAGE,
Vice President, Kensington Democratic Club.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your wonderful fight on the San Luis bill. I am a student of Fresno State and member of the Young Democrats. I find it frightening that our own Senators won't protect us from the bad parts of this bill. Keep up the fight. We of the valley are behind you.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ZAVER.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Many of us in the San Joaquin Valley are praying that you and the sponsors of the

amendment to S. 44 will be successful. We will be cheering you when you fight on the beaches, in the fields, and in the streets defending the rights of the people.

SUSIE RABOURN,
Legislative Chairman of Fresno Democratic Women's Club.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Member, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your stand on 160-acre limitation. Please use all possible influence to write San Luis water bill without such loopholes as Reclamation Bureau maneuvered at Pine Flat Dam. Acreage limitation will help equalize opportunities for developing this valley and ameliorate present ruthless exploitation of farm laborers.

ROLLIN PICKFORD, Jr.
Mrs. GLENNA PICKFORD.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your support of the excess land law, is very much appreciated here. Stick to it.

EUNICE TRUE GRIFFIN.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your struggle to have excess land law apply to hold San Luis project. Please keep up fight.

CARL LANDAUER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We, as Californians, thank you for your stand on bill S. 44. We urge you to continue your fight.

Mr. and Mrs. PHILIP GREENE.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Water is the lifeline of our State. Judicious use of it is essential the 160-acre limitation of Federal use of water must be maintained. We are counting on your support.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT REVILLA.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*
Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on the 160-acre limitation law which is so vital to the welfare of California. Keep up the good fight.

MARIE R. WOMACK.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Young Democrats of Fresno County congratulate you for your courageous fight for acreage limitation and against land speculation in the San Joaquin Valley.

JEFFERSON E. HAHESY,
President, Young Democrats of Fresno County.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your fight to retain 160-acre limitation on water. Please hold the line in public interest.

WAYNE WELCH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 12, 1959.
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We Californians are grateful for your gallant defense of reclamation law. Keep up your fight on San Luis.

DANIEL AND MARY DIXON.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Member, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand to amend the bill creating San Luis project. One hundred and sixty acres limitation essential to insure equitable distribution cost of obtaining water. As a teacher and social worker, I am in complete support of your amendment.

PATRICIA PICKFORD.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for brave men who defend at San Luis the right of families to make homes on the land.

EDWARD STEICHEN.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The support for a democratic agrarian policy from many representative groups in California is most encouraging.

For all the reasons I have outlined, I hope the Senate will agree to the amendments we have offered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly prior to what I hope will be a vote on the Douglas amendment. Some things were said by the Senator from California which must be answered in the RECORD, in fairness to those of us who respectfully oppose the Senator in this debate.

I wish to restate the legal situation which confronts us. It is a legal situation which in effect has been confessed over and over again by the senior Senator from California, who is insisting that section 6(a) remain in the bill.

I will state the case in this way: Section 6(a) either will or will not affect Federal reclamation laws. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the senior Senator from Oregon have repeated over and over again the thesis of their argument, namely, that if section 6(a) remains in the bill the 160-acre limitation will be adversely affected in relation to thousands and thousands and thousands of acres of land in the Central Valley of California, which is admitted to be, if water is applied to it, the most fertile and richest land in the entire Nation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has put figures in the RECORD to show that in the case of one owner, one large corporation, there is ownership of more than 400,000 acres of this land in question. The Southern Pacific Railroad got the land shown on the checkerboard map at the rear of the Senate Chamber at the time of the homestead settlements in this country, on the basis of an understanding with the Government that it would build a railroad, which it never built; in other words, the Southern Pacific Railroad got the land without carrying out its obligation. In this so-called Federal service area, about which we are debating the Southern Pacific Railroad owns 120,000 acres of the rich land.

Mr. President, the two Senators from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois have no intention of failing in their obligation to do everything possible in this debate to prevent the senior Senator from California from succeeding in keeping in the bill section 6(a), which in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon will affect, and affect adversely, the reclamation laws. That is the legal proposition about which we are talking, Mr. President.

In his remarks of Thursday, the senior Senator from California, backed by the junior Senator, doubted that the Federal Government could "impose reclamation law upon California." The senior Senator, however, said that he felt a specific exemption from the law on the extended San Luis project—miscalled the "State" project because the extension will be the result of substantial Federal expenditures—could avoid possible future lawsuits which might tie up the project.

Can the United States impose reclamation law upon California? To me, this puts the wrong question. The real question is this: Can the United States place upon water developed by Federal projects, restrictions which will prevent this water from being used unjustly to enrich huge corporate landholders?

This is the basic question at issue. S. 44 is not a bill to create a joint State-Federal project for the benefit of all the people of California. Rather, S. 44 is a bill which simply uses the State of California as a conduit for transferring water heavily subsidized by the Central Valley project. The great bulk of this water has been stored by dams which the people of all the States in the Union have helped build in California. Who are the beneficiaries? They are principally a group of large landholders in Southern Kings and Kern Counties, oil companies, the Southern Pacific Co., the Kern County Land Co., the Tejon Ranch, and other large holdings.

Thus, we have only one more in a long series of devices to avoid the consequences of reclamation law in California.

Years ago the attempt was made to repeal the law in the Central Valley. That effort failed. An attempt was made to bypass the law by having the works constructed by the Army Engineers. The Flood Control Act was amended in an attempt to make this device futile—section 8, Flood Control Act of 1944. The amendment has not been successful to date because the large landowners have not signed contracts to abide by the 160-acre limitation.

Various State takeover proposals were made. These fell because they were far too big a chunk for California's taxpayers to swallow.

Now we have the latest device. For a comparatively modest amount, some quarter of a billion dollars, a so-called State project is being pinned on to the tail of the Federal San Luis project. Much of it is not even a new project. It is a new name for an old project, always contemplated in the full development of

the Central Valley project, both by Federal and State engineers.

This evanescent project—this new name for an old project—is solemnly held by my good friends from California to be something uniquely Californian, on which applying reclamation law would be a gross intrusion, a violation of sovereignty.

This would be true under existing law without any of the circumspect language of S. 44, if the water being carried was, in fact, water developed solely at State dams and carried to its final point of delivery through a State-financed system.

But this is not, as I have said before, what we are dealing with here. Every drop of water that the State will distribute has been developed by the federally constructed Central Valley project—and I believe that this will be true in the future, on the basis of the record of last Tuesday, Thursday, and yesterday, indicating that the State government, and even indeed the junior Senator from California are seeking Federal funds for the so-called State project. And the power for moving this water of the State project at reasonable cost will exist only because of the Central Valley project power pool, again constructed with great Federal subventions.

This alleged State project we are dealing with, therefore, is merely a vision created in the hope that it can somehow transform everybody's water to water reserved only for a few people. I do not believe that this entity is any different from an irrigation district—which is a State agency, with governmental powers.

In its relations with such entities, and with water users in general, the Federal Government has the undoubted right, and has always asserted it firmly, to govern the policy under which water from dams built under the reclamation law is used.

I quote Senator Newlands, of Nevada, a sponsor of the original reclamation act:

> And so the wise policy of the National Government in this act has been to encourage homebuilding, and to destroy land monopoly; not only the monopoly of public land, but to break up the existing land monopolies throughout the arid regions. * * *
>
> We provided that water rights could be secured for lands in private ownership within reach of Government projects, to be guarded against monopoly by preventing any proprietor from securing water rights for more than 160 acres, the amount of land fixed in the bill (speech before the Sacramento Valley Development Association, October 1, 1905; in hearings on S. 912, 80th Cong. 1st sess., p. 1326).

Another sponsor, Representative Mondell, of Wyoming, told the House, volume 35, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6678:

> Under nearly every project undertaken (there will be lands in private ownership which deserve to have water, which in equity we should provide) providing their owners are willing to comply with the conditions of the act; and in order that no such lands shall be held in large quantitites or by nonresident owners, it is provided that no water right for more than 160 acres shall be sold to any landowner, who must also be a resident or occupant of his land. This provision was drawn with a view to breaking up any large landholdings which might exist in the vicinity of Government works and to insure occupancy by the owner of the land reclaimed.

These quotations could be multiplied as to the firm intent of the law, and I could quote decisions and administrative rulings which specifically carried out the broad intentions of the framers of the law—and I include the Warren Act of 1911, which was designed to facilitate off-project deliveries in accordance with the specific terms of the law. But such elaboration is not necessary to the main point which is simply this: The intent of Congress in writing reclamation law was to prevent land monopoly and to refuse service of water to land monopolists, on or off the project. The question is not one of whose land or whose water but—and here is the crux of our argument—the question is what facilities these waters pass through.

I say again that the so-called State San Luis project is merely another attempt in the long series to avoid the effect of the law which land monopolists have always been fighting. I say that the whole history of reclamation law and its enforcement condemns such attempts and deals firmly with them. I do not believe that we should betray these farsighted men who wrote the law at the turn of the century by coloring this latest attempt to avoid the plain consequences of a fine law with a pale wash of legality. I say again that if the State or any other non-Federal agency builds a project without Federal funds no special language is required in this legislation to assure that Federal regulations do not apply. Therefore, the special language in 6(a) and other places in this bill is included for the benefit of interests who are or will seek the benefits resulting from Federal expenditure without complying with Federal regulations.

Furthermore, I do not believe that adoption of Senator DOUGLAS' amendment, applying the 160-acre limitation to the so-called joint facilities in the broad San Luis plan will bring about "future lawsuits which might tie up the project," although I will admit that, in the West, wherever there is water, there is a lawsuit over it. This would be true in any case.

But on what grounds would the Kern County land barons sue?

There is no water right to water that does not exist. A canal is not a stream running by your property. It is not a reservoir under your land. The water is, in effect, owned by a public utility, the Central Valley project and its extensions, and is available to anyone who can reasonably be served by the water under such terms and conditions as the laws governing the utility set forth.

No, gentlemen, the only reason that there is opposition to reclamation law and Senator DOUGLAS' amendment in the so-called joint service area is that the opponents think they have discovered a way around the law.

This opposition is not on the principle of State sovereignty or on any other principle. It is simply on the basis of expediency. Their opposition to a great and good law is, I think, based on the forlorn hope that the Senate of the United States will abandon the trust that the people of the United States have placed in us, and neglect its duty to guard the rights and to promote the general welfare of all the American people. This I believe the Senate will not do. And this, Mr. President, is the point of the argument which is being led here in the Senate by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. President, I state again to the senior Senator from California, "If you think section 6(a) does not make any difference, if you think section 6(a) does not in any way affect the reclamation laws, if you think section 6(a) has no effect whatsoever upon the 160-acre limitation, why do you not agree to strike out the section?"

We have put that question to the Senator time and time again. What is his reply? It is a highly fallacious one, Mr. President. The Senator says, in effect, that he does not want to delete the section because he thinks something which the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Oregon may have said up to this time in this debate may have some effect on some future court decision applying to the Federal reclamation laws. Mr. President, that is simply a plain absurdity.

The Senator from California read a telegram from a lawyer in California who is supposed to support the Senator's position on this matter, but I respectfully submit it is obvious from the message itself that the lawyer has never read this debate. If the lawyer has done so and gives the Senator that legal advice, I say, most goodnaturedly, the senior Senator from California needs a new lawyer.

Mr. President, what the reclamation laws mean as a matter of law cannot be changed one iota by anything the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Oregon say in this debate. What the reclamation laws mean from the standpoint of congressional intent has to be determined by the debates at the time the reclamation laws were enacted years and years ago, and not by anything we say in the debate in 1959. That happens to be elementary in regard to statutory construction. Congressional intent, congressional meaning, and congressional purpose in regard to the reclamation laws were elements which were decided when the reclamation laws were passed.

What the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon have been saying for days of debate on this measure is that we are asking to have section 6(a) stricken from the bill because we think it is a backdoor attempt to amend the reclamation laws. Of course, if we leave the section in the bill, what the Senator from California says in support of the provision he seeks to have retained in the bill will have tremendous weight before the courts in an interpretation of section 6(a), but it will have no effect if section 6(a) is removed from the bill, because there will not be any section 6(a) for the court to interpret or to apply.

Let me state the point again, Mr. President. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], a member of the committee, said to me before he left the Chamber for a few minutes on official business, "WAYNE, when you give your

next speech hit it again, because it goes to the very essence of this debate."

I respectfully say that section 6(a) is in the bill because the senior Senator from California and those behind section 6(a) are trying to amend the reclamation laws. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon are trying to strike section 6(a) from the bill because we say this bill is not the proper vehicle for an amendment to the reclamation laws. I have said over and over in the debate—and I shall state it again—I am perfectly willing to join with the senior Senator from California in consideration of a clean bill which proposes amendments to the reclamation laws, because I think the reclamation laws need to have a little reappraisal and possibly some amendment. But, Mr. President, the pending bill is not the proper vehicle for a consideration of amendments to the reclamation laws.

I state again that section 6(a), as the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon see it, will have an effect by way of amendment to the reclamation laws, and we do not think that section has any place in the bill under consideration. As a matter of law, deleting the section could not possibly, the senior Senator from California and his lawyer to the contrary notwithstanding, have the slightest effect upon an interpretation of existing reclamation laws, because the question of congressional intent and purpose was determined in the debates when the reclamation laws were adopted in the first instance, and could not possibly be modified by any debate decades later.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me ask my good friend once more what answer he would give me to a specific question.

Section 6(a) provides, as the Senator and I both well know:

> SEC. 6. (a) The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956.

The Senator seeks to eliminate that language. Does the Senator believe that if he succeeds in doing so, the Federal reclamation laws will be applicable to water deliveries under contract with the State of California?

Mr. MORSE. The Federal reclamation laws are applicable to Federal waters, and not to State waters. It is a question for the courts to determine as to what kind of waters are involved in the San Luis project. Both kinds may be involved. Only one kind may be involved. But I say that the floor of the Senate is not the place to determine that legal question, because it requires the presentation of legal proof on a very highly complicated legal issue. I do not propose to vote for section 6(a) to remain in the bill, because the Senator's statement of his own question shows an implied intent on his part to modify the Federal reclamation laws by determining a question of fact on the floor of the Senate, which question ought to be left to the courts to determine on the basis of legal proof.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator——

Mr. MORSE. I do not know to what extent——

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator——

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish.

I do not know to what extent the San Luis project may involve both Federal and State waters, but I say that the place to determine that question is in the courts, and not on the floor of the Senate.

I have told the Senator from California that I am not for the application of Federal reclamation laws to solely State waters. It would make no difference if I took an opposite view, because they could not possibly apply. But here we have a singular case, a novel case, a precedent-making case; and I want the precedent to be established by the courts by way of judicial determination, and not on the floor of the Senate by political plays. That is my point. So we should allow this kind of mixed case, in which there is involved a basic Federal dam, without which there would be no project at all, to be decided by the courts. We should leave it to the courts to determine to what extent and in what degree the Federal reclamation laws apply.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator deny the right of the Congress to make a policy decision?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. I am arguing against the Senator's policy. I am merely saying that it is very bad policy to have this kind of section in the bill, when the Senate does not know any more about the complicated facets of the problem than it does. The bill came to the floor of the Senate with section 6(a) in it. Now we discover that many members of the committee were not even aware of the implications of section 6(a). One member of the committee, when he discovered the implications of section 6(a), asked that he be allowed to cosponsor the Douglas amendment to eliminate it.

Another member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], after he became aware of what was involved in section 6(a), said he favored striking it out, because he did not believe it had received the consideration in committee that it would have received if the committee had been apprised of the implications of the section.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, it is exactly the same section that was in the bill a year ago when it passed the Senate. If the distinguished Senator does not deny the right of the Congress to make a policy decision as to whether it believes the State of California should be permitted to apply its own State laws without worry over the attempt by some to impose a Federal reclamation law upon State projects, why can we not establish such a policy?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is begging the issue. He assumes the result. We say that we do not know to what extent we are dealing with State waters. The senior Senator from California continually talks about a State project, as though this were exclusively a State project. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon have been trying to point out that this is a singular case. We do not know where the dividing line is between Federal and State water.

Mr. KUCHEL. What does the Senator mean when he says "Federal water" and "State water"? What does he intend to convey when he uses those expressions?

Mr. MORSE. The meaning is very simple. If Federal water is involved, Federal reclamation laws apply, and the 160-acre limitation becomes automatic.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is Federal water?

Mr. MORSE. If it is State water, the Federal 160-acre limitation does not apply. We are raising the question, What is involved in this project? How much of it is Federal water and how much, if any, is State water? To what extent are the waters commingled; and if they are commingled, have they lost their Federal characteristic and become a part of a State project? Or do they retain the basic Federal characteristic?

Mr. KUCHEL. How would the Senator determine whether a particular quantity of water was State or Federal?

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what I am trying to tell the Senator. Neither he nor I can determine that question. It is a highly complicated legal question, which calls for legal proof. It should be determined by the courts, and not on the floor of the Senate.

The whole question of Federal facilities is involved. The project involves Federal facilities, which are paid for by all the taxpayers, from California to New York. I believe that the taxpayers across the country have some interest in the project, to see to it that the Federal interest, to whatever extent it exists, is protected. That is why we want to leave the question to the courts. Is the Senator afraid of the judicial process? Would the Senator not like to see the question eventually come before the U.S. Supreme Court, if it should be carried that far?

Mr. KUCHEL. May I answer my friend?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am afraid that what my friend wants to do is to abdicate the duty and responsibility of the Congress to pass judgment on policy issues.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

Mr. KUCHEL. Here is a policy question. Let us go ahead and vote on it.

Mr. MORSE. Quite to the contrary, I am saying that it is such a bad policy the Senator from California is proposing that we should vote it down by eliminating section 6(a) from the bill. That is the legislative duty which faces the Senate. I am in favor of acting upon the policy.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from California is not the author of this bill. He is an instrument by which this policy decision, approved by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, approved by the Governor of California, approved by the State government, and all interested public agencies in California, has been brought to the floor of the

Senate, with the request that the Senate approve it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has just enunciated an interesting chain of false assumptions. I shall proceed to discuss that chain of assumptions.

I think the Senator is quite wrong if he thinks section 6(a) has all the approval he has told the Senate it has. I wish to tell the Senator why I think so.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator has the right to his opinion, but I respectfully say that the Senator from Oregon is wrong.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. I am not interested in exchanging statements that each of us thinks the other is mistaken. I am interested in discussing what I believe to be the facts.

I believe it will be found that the author of section 6(a) on the House side is not insisting that it remain in the bill, whereas the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]—I do not wish to make this statement in his absence. Much has been said by the senior Senator from California to the effect that there is great unity behind section 6(a). I make the statement on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that there is not the unity behind section 6(a) which the senior Senator from California—I am sure honestly—believes to be the case. He is mistaken if he thinks there is unity behind section 6(a) on the part of the proponents of the bill. He is mistaken if he thinks there is unity in California. The longer this debate continues, and the more the people of California become aware of what is involved in section 6(a), the greater will be the evidence of disunity on this question.

The junior Senator from California has now returned to the Chamber, and I hope he will follow my remarks.

It is my understanding that the junior Senator from California has taken the position from the beginning that he does not believe section 6(a) makes any difference in the bill, so far as the Federal reclamation laws are concerned. He does not believe that it makes any difference whether section 6(a) is in or out of the bill.

If I have not heard him say so more than once, I should get a hearing aid—and no one has ever told me that I am even slightly deaf.

The junior Senator from California, in my judgment, has never gone as far as the senior Senator from California has gone in respect to section 6(a). He *has left me* with the impression that he would be perfectly willing to have section 6(a) come out of the bill, because he does not believe it makes any difference whether it stays in or comes out. Of course, the junior Senator from California is in a position that many of us find ourselves in from time to time. He would like to go along with his colleague, because his colleague, the senior Senator from California, happens to be the leader in the fight for section 6(a), and therefore the junior Senator is not advocating deleting section 6(a). But certainly he has made it clear in the debate that he has no objection if it comes out. In other words, he is not insisting that it stay in.

Let me say that I have talked to some other leaders in California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield. If I have made any misstatement, I hope the Senator will correct me. I do not want to create the slightest wrong impression as to the position taken by the junior Senator from California and as to whatever impression he has left with me.

Mr. ENGLE. The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has represented my position correctly. In saying that I wish to emphasize again the telegram I have received from the Governor of California. This is what he said. I wish to read it again, because it states my position as well as the Governor's position. He says:

> Upon the basis of my own legal analysis and that of all my legal advisors I am convinced that the Federal reclamation laws do and will apply to all Federal facilities and service areas of the San Luis project. In addition, with or without the language contained in section 6(a) under S. 44, the Federal reclamation laws do not and, in my view, should not apply to the State facilities and State service areas of the project.

That is precisely what I think. I believe the Governor has correctly stated the law. If the amendment comes to a vote I intend to vote for keeping the language in the bill, because I believe that the Federal reclamation law should not apply to a State service area. That is what the language in 6(a) provides. However, that is merely a statement of what the law presently provides. Whether in or out of the bill it will not change the law, as the senior Senator from Oregon very clearly has stated time and time again.

Mr. MORSE. In the statement of the junior Senator from California we see again focused what the real difference is in regard to section 6(a) between the protagonists and the antagonists of that particular section. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon do not go so far as do the two Senators from California as to what the application of 6(a) will be. We say, "Let that question be decided by the court." I should like to go down the road with the two Senators from California on the principle that Federal laws can apply only to Federal facilities. However, it is for the court to determine, in the light of the operative facts of a given case, whether we are dealing with a Federal project or with a State project; or, if we are dealing with a mixed project, to what extent and to what degree the Federal reclamation laws apply to that project.

Let me say that I am satisfied the telegram of the Governor of California makes perfectly clear that he is not taking the position that we should modify the Federal reclamation laws in regard to this project. I happen to know that that would necessarily be the case with respect to the Governor of California, because the present Governor of California when he was Attorney General of the State of California took a great reclamation case right up to the United States Supreme Court. The present Governor of the State of California, Pat Brown, is on record over and over again in favor of protecting the family farmer of California and of preventing large landowners from squeezing out the little fellow and making an unconscionable profiteering and privateering profit out of large land holdings.

I cannot quote the Governor of California. I do not purport to quote him. However, I wish to say that, in my judgment, there is in fact, no difference between the point of view of the Governor of California and that of the junior Senator from California. I wish to restate it, because over and over again in the debate the Governor of California has been quoted by the senior Senator from California. I wish to say that I am satisfied the Governor of California does not differ in his opinion from the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. In other words, there is not in California the unity which the senior Senator from California suggests in regard to the retention of section 6(a) in the bill.

Let us take some further evidence. Yesterday we placed in the RECORD a telegram from the State Grange of California, urging that section 6(a) come out of the bill. Does that spell unity?

We put into the RECORD yesterday telegram after telegram from farm groups in California, pleading with us that we hold the line until we can get section 6(a) out of the bill. Does that bespeak the unity which the senior Senator from California gave the Senate assurance early this afternoon was the present state of public opinion in California?

Mr. President, we put into the RECORD yesterday telegrams from Democratic leader after Democratic leader in the State of California, urging that section 6(a) come out of the bill. Does that bespeak the unity in California which the senior Senator from California told the Senate earlier this afternoon exists in that State?

It does not. The telegrams continue to pour in. For example, we have a telegram from Mr. Peter Odegaard. He is a great educator in California and the former president of Reed College in my State. He was a candidate in the Democratic convention a year ago for United States Senator, and was defeated by the very able junior Senator from California. He is a recognized civic leader in the State of California. Let us see what Peter Odegaard says:

> BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
> Senator WAYNE MORSE,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
> Congratulations on your fight on Senate bill 44 many Californians hope you will continue to press for elimination of exemption provision in section 1 and section 6a and deletion of subsection F, G, H, of section 3.
> Best wishes,
> PETER ODEGAARD.

We have a telegram from Ralph E. Pruett, a member of the Fresno County Democratic Central Committee. If any county would be benefited by the San

Luis project, it is Fresno County. Yet Mr. Pruett says:

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for good fight on San Luis. Most of us in Fresno County favor San Luis only because irrigation with acreage limitation will make possible family size farms. We oppose San Luis if it is to mean more prosperous plantations and more destitute migrant workers.

RALPH E. PRUETT,
Member Fresno County Democratic Central Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without reading the remaining telegrams I have before me, that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Congratulations on your vigorous stand against the efforts of special interest groups who seek to exempt the San Luis project from Federal reclamation law.

RICHARD S. GUERIN NORTH,
Chairman, California Federation of Young Democrats.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincere thanks from the veterans in the heart of the Central Valley of California on San Luis project bill to enforce 160-acre limitation law. This law is necessary to stop factory farming in California and open more farmland for veterans and small taxpayers.

EVAN MCPHERSON,
Adjutant, Post 884, VFW, Fresno, Calif.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1599.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your fight for the San Joaquins west side. Acreage limitation prerequisite to remedying the social ills resulting from mammoth farming. More important than the giveaway are the human values involved.

ROY GREENAWAY,
Vice President, California Democratic Counsel.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

California Labor Federation wholeheartedly appreciates your efforts on S. 44 San Luis project on behalf of people of California. Urge you to continue the fight to obtain full application of reclamation law to Federal subsidized water development. We must firmly close the door to unjust enrichment, to monopoly of water resources, and to subsidized giantism in agriculture. Your policy would secure the greatest good for the greatest number, and stop aggrandizement of large landowners.

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary-Treasurer, California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following fight on San Luis; Californians are fortunate to have your loyal support.

LYLE F. GRAY.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May I, a social worker, add my support to your stand on the San Luis project bill; 160-acre limitation only way to spread cost and benefits of additional irrigation water to promote welfare of all California citizens.

ELAINE GIANNOPOULOS.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for all you are doing to preserve reclamation law in California. Keep up fight until you win for us.

WALTER PACKARD.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to have the 160-acre limitation law on water. Appreciate your fight in the public interest. Our club is behind you.

GRASSROOT DEMOCRATS.

AUSTIN, TEX., *May 12, 1959.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Texas State AFL–CIO appreciates and endorses the efforts you and Senator DOUGLAS are making to require full application of reclamation law to San Luis project. The money of all the people is being used in this water development project, therefore every effort should be made to insure its benefits going to the many and not the few.

JERRY R. HOLLEMAN,
President, Texas State AFL–CIO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the exception of the last one, from the Texas State AFL–CIO, all the telegrams I have received come from California, and they deny and rebut the argument of the senior Senator from California with respect to the great unity in California in favor of section 6(a).

I am about to close, and I shall then ask for a quorum, if that will meet the approval of the acting majority leader.

I hope the Senate will not forget what the legal issue is. All we are asking is that there be stricken from the bill one section which looks as though it is an attempt to amend the Federal reclamation laws, and that we wait to take up any amendment of the Federal reclamation laws by way of a clean bill, because there are many phases of the Federal reclamation laws which I agree ought to be amended. But this is not one of them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bush	Carroll
Anderson	Byrd, Va.	Case, N.J.
Beall	Byrd, W. Va.	Case, S. Dak.
Bennett	Capehart	Church
Bible	Carlson	Clark
Cotton	Jackson	Muskie
Curtis	Javits	Neuberger
Dirksen	Johnston, S.C.	O'Mahoney
Dodd	Jordan	Pastore
Douglas	Keating	Prouty
Eastland	Kefauver	Proxmire
Ellender	Kennedy	Randolph
Engle	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Kuchel	Russell
Frear	Langer	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Lausche	Scott
Goldwater	Long	Smathers
Gore	McCarthy	Smith
Green	McClellan	Sparkman
Gruening	McNamara	Stennis
Hart	Magnuson	Talmadge
Hartke	Mansfield	Thurmond
Hayden	Martin	Williams, Del.
Hennings	Morse	Yarborough
Hill	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Holland	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hruska	Mundt	
Humphrey	Murray	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for himself and other Senators, striking out certain provisions of the bill (putting the question).

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill, but before speaking on the motion I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon; however, the adoption of their amendment does not clear up the basic opposition to the bill.

I should like to point out the fact that under the bill we are proposing to spend $290 million to bring into production new acreage on which to grow agricultural crops which are already in surplus and agricultural crops of which we have an overabundance.

This bill proposes at a cost of $290 million to the American taxpayers to furnish water to a total of 440,000 acres of agricultural land.

On the basis of estimates submitted by the various departments the indicated Federal and non-Federal investment costs for irrigating this land would be about $1,576 per acre.

It simply does not make sense for one agency of the U.S. Government to spend $290 million to bring 300,000 acres of land into production while at the same time we have another agency of the Government paying hundreds of millions of dollars to farmers for taking land out of production.

This project, if approved, is estimated to increase cotton acreage from 49,200 to 132,000 acres, increase truck crops and alfalfa from none to 88,000 acres, increase irrigated pasture from none to 44,000 acres, increase tree and vine crops from none to 22,000 acres, and increase other field crops from none to 66,000 acres, although there would be a slight reduction in the hay and grain crops acreage.

In defense of this project the proponents claim that criticism of the project's bringing in new acreage, thereby adding to our present agriculture surpluses, has been overcome by the adoption of the so-called Russell amendment.

The Russell amendment which was adopted last Thursday provides that none of the waters provided under this irrigation project can be used for the irrigation of new land upon which any basic crops will be produced. This amendment specifies new land and will have little effect upon the proposed project by virtue of the fact that this project deals with the irrigation of approximately 300,000 acres of land, all of which has an historical record of being irrigated in that they have been irrigated by deep wells.

To confirm this point, I talked with Mr. John F. Cook, program specialist, Cotton Stabilization Service, who after examining the language of the Russell amendment stated that in the opinion of his department less than one-fourth of the acreage involved under S. 44 would be affected by the Russell amendment.

Furthermore, I point out that the original justification of this whole project by the Department of the Interior was based upon the assumption that 132,000 acres of the San Luis project will be devoted to the production of cotton, and in estimating the projected income possibilities of the farm land in this new project on page 99 of the Department of the Interior's report the estimated income from these 132,000 acres of cotton is listed at $15,818,000 annually.

The total estimated production of the 440,000 acres is only $35,216,000.

Furthermore, as has been pointed out by the Senators from Illinois and Oregon, the major benefits under the $290 million program would not, as has been suggested, go to many small farmers.

Even the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon will not entirely remedy this situation. I say that as one who supported their amendment. It would be a simple procedure to break the acreage of land down into small blocks, to form separate corporate entities, or to transfer ownership to individual members of the family.

In any event once the water is made available in the area the land will be used for the production of crops. Whether these crops are produced on large or small farms makes no difference as far as the taxpayers are concerned.

They will be called upon to pay the extra costs of storing these additional crops.

Now, who benefits under this bill?

The Department of Interior report on page 89 states that of the 440,000 acres in the San Luis area, 4 landowners own 143,700 acres; 10 own 68,500 acres; 52 own 111,200 acres; and 64 own 39,700 acres. This means that 130 landowners in the area own a total of 363,100 acres.

As pointed out earlier, based upon the Department of Agriculture's report this project is estimated to increase cotton acreage by 82,000 acres.

The junior Senator from California claimed the other day that the type of cotton produced in California is a different type from that produced in the South and would not be in competition with Southern cotton. I asked the Department of Agriculture to comment upon that question, and I was advised that the cotton produced in the State of California is in direct competition with the Southern cotton; that it is all classified as being upland cotton; and that all the cotton being produced in California is presently being supported by the Department of Agriculture. California produces the same type of cotton as the South, and it is the same type of cotton of which there is such a surplus.

It is interesting to note that in the year 1958 California produced 1.6 bales of upland or long staple cotton. Loans were made on 835,000 bales, and the Government still holds from the 1958 crop 752,000 bales of cotton produced in the State of California.

In 1957 the Department of Agriculture under the soil bank program paid $2,741,143.72 to 105 farmers in California for the purpose of getting them to withdraw 28,724 acres from the production of cotton.

The bill proposes to bring into production 80,000 acres of cotton, which is nearly three times as much cotton to be brought into production as was taken out of production by the $2¾ million payment only 2 years ago.

Now, under S. 44 and at an estimated cost of $290 million it is proposed that we bring into production 300,000 acres of new croplands, of which amount 82,000 acres will be used for the production of cotton. Other crops scheduled to be produced are also in oversupply.

I repeat, based upon information furnished by Mr. Cook of the Cotton Stabilization Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Russell amendment will not prohibit the production of cotton in this area, as was intended.

Our Government today has in excess of $9 billion invested in surplus agricultural products. Storage costs alone on these surplus commodities this year will exceed $600 million.

In one year alone, our Government paid more than $600 million to farmers for the purpose of encouraging them to let their land lie idle.

Today it is proposed to spend another $290 million to bring into production 440,000 acres of land.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand, from what the Senator has said, that the land could be applied to basic crops, including cotton, so that from the point of view of the New England textile plants, which are struggling with a cotton surplus problem, passage of the bill would increase the cotton surplus?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The passage of the bill would increase the cotton surplus. The Russell amendment, I was advised by the Department of Agriculture, would apply to less than one-fourth of the acreage devoted to any of the basic crops by virtue of the fact that the land in this area has a historical record of having been irrigated by wells and thereby would not come under the Russell amendment definition as to new lands.

The Department of Agriculture had written a letter to the Department of the Interior commenting upon the bill. I read again the last paragraph of the letter from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior:

> The project is estimated to increase cotton acreage from 49,200 to 132,000 acres, increase truck crops and alfalfa from 0 to 88,000 acres, increase irrigated pasture from 0 to 44,000 acres, increase tree and vine crops from 0 to 22,000 acres, increase other field crops from 0 to 66,000 acres and to decrease hay and grain crops from 98,700 to 44,000 acres.

I made the statement the other day that while it is recognized and admitted that the Department of the Interior did recommend this project, and perhaps the Bureau of the Budget approved the project, I have been unable to find any evidence—and no one else has come forward with any such evidence—to show that the Department of Agriculture is in favor of the bill. This is the Department which will be called upon to pay to take this land out of production or to support the crops produced. I have talked with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, and they have said they were not asked for an opinion. The Department of Agriculture did write the Department of the In-

terior and called attention to the fact that adoption of the project would bring into production several thousand acres of new cropland and that these acres would produce crops already in oversupply.

They also bring out the fact that the Russell amendment, even though offered with good intentions, would not be applicable in this particular case because three-fourths of these lands would not fall under the definition of "newly irrigated."

At some future date when we need increased agricultural production to feed an expanded population this project may well be justified, but it cannot be justified today in the face of our huge inventories of surplus products. Certainly it cannot be justified in the face of a $10 billion deficit.

The point has been made that a special type of cotton, called extra long staple cotton, can be raised on the proposed project. However, I invite attention to the fact that even if this acreage is devoted to the production of extra long staple cotton we already have a surplus of that type of cotton.

We are now having to support the price of extra long staple cotton. The stockpiling agency has 220,000 bales of it on hand which it desires to get rid of. That cotton would be placed back on the market.

All of these crops are in oversupply. No one will deny that fact.

On April 28, 1959, representatives of the Department of Agriculture testified before the Tariff Commission, asking for an increase in tariff or for quotas on extra long staple cotton on the basis that we now have an oversupply of that particular kind of cotton. In their testimony they said that we had a supply large enough to last more than 3 years without any production whatsoever of that particular commodity. As to the other types of cotton, we know that we have millions of bales stored in warehouses, and we are paying millions to get acreage out of production.

In my opinion there can be no justification for the enactment of the bill at this time, bringing into production this new land, even though it may at some future date be practicable.

I urge the defeat of the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise enthusiastically to support the position of the Senator from Delaware. It seems to me that this is about as clear-cut an economy vote as Senators will have an opportunity to cast in this session.

As the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, the bill authorizes $290 million. That is substantially more than is involved in the present version of the depressed areas bill, which is in the House of Representatives, and which has been denounced from one end of the country to the other as extravagant spending.

This bill would greatly increase the production of farm products, some of which, as the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, are now in surplus.

I should like to reaffirm something I said the other day. While many of the crops proposed to be produced, such as alfalfa, vegetables, fruits, and so forth, are not now in surplus, it seems to me that anyone who has studied the farm problem over the past years must recognize that those commodities might very well be in surplus in the near future.

If there is one truism in agricultural economics, it is that we are now having a technological explosion in farm production.

Another truism is that the demand for food is fairly inelastic. If we increase the production of food the price the farmer receives drops catastrophically.

The bill would do one of two things—or perhaps both. Either it would depress farm income, or it would result in a great increase in the burden on the Federal taxpayer, who would have to take the surpluses off the market if we support farm income.

It seems to me that the issue is very clear-cut. Senators who believe in safeguarding farm income, and those who believe in economy in government, will vote in favor of the proposal of the Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I join my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in complimenting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on his analysis of the bill.

I congratulate the Senator from Delaware on his clear presentation of the fallacy of the bill. It seems impossible that we are about to vote to bring a vast amount of new land under irrigation, so that it can be put into production, while at the same time we are paying large sums of money to induce farmers to take land out of production.

I concur in the thought that Senators who favor economy—or even commonsense—in Government should support the motion of the distinguished Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill. I earnestly hope the Senate will so vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] a few questions about the bill.

The first question is this: Did the bill receive Senate approval last year?

Mr. KUCHEL. It did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Were there any dissenting votes last year?

Mr. KUCHEL. There were two.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator whether the bill has the support and endorsement of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed, it has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it have the support of the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. KUCHEL. It has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it have the support of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. KUCHEL. It has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it in line with the administration program?

Mr. KUCHEL. There can be no question about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Were all the factors which have been discussed taken into account by the Bureau of the Budget before the bill became a part of the administration program?

Mr. KUCHEL. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say in response to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that the bill was approved last year. It is within the confines of the President's budget, and it has been carefully thought out over a period of time. So some of the comparisons which are made seem to fall of their own weight. In my judgment they have no substance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Illinois has enumerated a number of agencies. Will he also ask the Senator from California if he can produce any letter or statement from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that it approves the bill? Certainly the Department of Agriculture is one agency which would be vitally interested in the proposal to bring under cultivation 440,000 acres of land.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer to that question is, of course——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. "No."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is simply this: This subject is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. I do not know that it is the function of the committee to ask the Secretary of Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture whether this kind of measure should be approved. If it is a measure involving subjects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, that is the place to go to obtain approval of it, because that agency has jurisdiction of the subject matter. That agency includes the component agency, namely, the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If this proposal does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, I ask the Senator why the Department of the Interior should request the comments of the Department of Agriculture, and why, after receiving the letter from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior did not send it to the Congress.

I repeat the Department of Agriculture did not endorse this bill. They are not on record as favoring bringing into production new croplands when we already have our warehouses full of surplus crops.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter of interdepartmental character, and is not a responsibility of ours. I am pointing out the essential fact that I have been given to understand that this bill was a part of the administration's program. It has been approved by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Certainly it is within the context of the administration's program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. In addition to its being a part of the administration's program, I suggest, from this side of the aisle, that this is a project which I have gone over with extreme care. I have been over every part of it. I have studied

it twice in anticipation of action by the Senate. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that it also has the approval of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe it to be a fine, worthwhile project and is one which could be adopted without danger to the agricultural situation in the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure that either by silence or otherwise I approved this program last year in the Senate. Obviously in the absence of any argument or contention which would persuade me to vote otherwise, I believe that in the interest of consistency I ought to support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I cannot begin to thank the minority leader for the comments he has just made. I am rather surprised at the opposition of my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. My friends from Wisconsin comes from a State which has received munificent treatment by the Federal Treasury in price supports throughout the years. How much of that has come back into the Treasury of the United States? Not a penny.

But here today we have a project which is a reimbursable project, the moneys derived from which will be returned to the Federal Treasury by the water users and by the power users in the State of California. This is no largess. This is something which has the approval of every affected agency. I am greatly distressed by my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Is it not fair to say that the approval by the Bureau of the Budget constitutes the approval by the administration? I think so.

It is also fair to point out—and with this I conclude my statement—that the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered an amendment with respect to the so-called basic crops. That is exactly in line with what the Senate did 2 years ago in the upper Colorado River legislation, which was also recommended by the Eisenhower administration.

There is nothing new and novel in the proposed legislation we have before us. Only a few days ago one of the Senators from the State of Washington came to the Senate with a project, likewise recommended. It was approved by the Senate. Why should this proposed project be chosen for opposition?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In answer to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California I might say that when I opened my remarks I conceded that the project had the approval of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, which indicates that the administration is in favor of it. That, however, does not make it sacred. I have said, and I repeat the statement, if anyone can show me where the Department of Agriculture has indicated in any way that it is in favor of this project, I should like to see it. I cannot conceive that the Department of Agriculture, which asked Congress to appropriate $600 million annually to pay farmers to take land out of production, should now ask that $290 million be spent through another agency to bring land back into production.

I did not support the measure last year, and I am not supporting it this year. Whether it passes or not this year is a decision for the Senate to make.

I repeat that, notwithstanding all the arguments which have been made by the proponents of this project, no one denies the fact that the project will increase the surplus farm commodities which are already in oversupply. That statement cannot be denied. It cannot be denied that the project will increase the production of cotton and all the other basic crops, notwithstanding the adoption of the Russell amendment, because the Russell amendment spells out newly irrigated land, and the Department of Agriculture has said that less than one-fourth of the project will fall into the category of newly irrigated land, and that all the rest will come in under old basic allotment.

The enactment of this bill will further increase, through the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture, the multimillion dollar storage expense of these products. We cannot escape that fact in any manner, shape, or form. I do not believe that the proponents will even attempt to deny it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I merely wish to make a brief statement in favor of the bill as it stands, and against the motion to recommit it.

I am very much distressed that Senators from the Middle West, particularly, should raise their voices against the bill. Because of a geographic phenomenon, most of the western part of the United States is arid. That whole vast section of the United States which lies between the Great Plains and the Pacific mountain barriers, such as the Sierras and the Cascades, does not have enough water in natural precipitation. There can be no agriculture in vast sections of California, Oregon, and Washington and in the great mountain States like Arizona, Wyoming and Colorado unless there is reclamation. Theodore Roosevelt recognized that fact, when this great President who was so familiar with the West, established the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

I recently saw a compilation prepared by the Department of Agriculture on the vast sums paid in Federal price supports and soil bank payments since those programs were instituted. If I am not mistaken, two of the three crops which have received the largest sums in price support benefactions and soil bank benefactions are mainly grown in the Middle West, and those are corn and wheat. Price supports do not return any direct financial payment to the Treasury.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will be Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. My State receives to some limited degree wheat price supports and soil bank payments. Notwithstanding that fact, in 1957 I was one of only seven Members of the Senate who voted to do away with the acreage reserve of the soil bank, because in my opinion it had become very extravagant and wasteful.

I believe that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is on the floor, was another Senator who cast his vote in favor of that proposal, as was also the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I do not see how Senators from the Middle West can say that a reclamation project in one of the States of the Far West is a wasteful project, when most of the cost of the project will be returned to the Treasury in the form of revenues collected for the water and power produced or in the form of amortization for the development of land, and in the payments for pumping. We must even pay for what it costs to pump the water, in addition to the water rights. I believe that is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My friend, the Senator from California says it is correct, and of course it is.

By contrast, the vast sums spent for farm price supports and soil bank payments are not returned to the Treasury at all. Therefore I do not understand how Senators from the lush Middle West can take the position that the costly price support payments are not a drain on the Treasury, whereas the Federal reclamation projects, which are reimbursable, do constitute a drain on the Treasury. It does not seem to me to be a fair or reasonable contention.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not true that because of these reclamation projects, millions of Americans have found opportunity in the western part of the United States, and that if we wait for such time as when there will be no surpluses of cotton or wheat, we will wait until eternity, except if we should go through another wartime period. I believe if we will examine the record we will find that we have always had surpluses of cotton and wheat through long periods of time, except during wartime.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from North Dakota is eminently correct. He is a man of consistent position. He has supported price support payments, which are important to his great agricultural State, and he has supported, also, the Federal reclamation program which operates in a few parts of the Dakotas and throughout most of the American West.

I think it is a historical fact, which we must recognize, that there would be virtually no agriculture in the Rocky Mountain region if it were not for the Federal reclamation program. When Senators take the floor to urge the defeat of a reclamation project such as this, they are, in effect, saying there should be no expansion of agriculture in most of the American West from the Continental Divide on to the Cascades and Sierras.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for the consistent

support he has given to this irrigation program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California, the fact that the Bureau of the Budget favors a program should in no way, it seems to me, foreclose the right of Senators to make, or try to make, economies in the program. The minority leader offers the Senate a fantastic argument when he says that this is a program which cannot be cut simply because the Bureau of the Budget has recommended it. I expect to offer amendments in the coming months which will reduce authorizations or appropriations approved by the Bureau of the Budget, whenever I find there is fat—as there is in this case—in their recommendations. They have and will yield to political pressure to advocate unwarranted spending.

The second argument made by the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon, that this is money which will be returned, and is not simply a gift, is not quite accurate. The fact is that this is largely interest-free money, because it relates to irrigation, as contrasted with bills which so far have been under fire the most in the country, namely, the housing bill and the depressed areas bill. Those are largely loan programs, which make available funds which will be returned to the Federal Treasury without the loss of a nickel, because they will be paid back with interest. Interest loss on this bill may in the judgment of some competent students of the legislation equal the total authorization in the bill; and of course the American taxpayer will have to make up the full interest loss.

The Senator from Oregon makes an excellent point, and the only point, I believe, raised by opponents of reclamation which really relates to the heart of the argument raised by the Senator from Delaware. He points out that it is necessary to have irrigation in the Far West if there is to be any kind of agricultural program at all. Of course, he is correct.

I think the Senate and the House which means the American taxpayers have been enormously generous to that part of our country, and properly so. I think it is highly desirable that there be this kind of program. However, it seems to me that it is a matter of timing. At present, I think it is a masterpiece of understatement to say there is no need for a greater production of food. It is true that some agricultural commodities are not in surplus, but many of those are likely to be in surplus in the future. However, for the next 5 or 10 years there is not likely to be any vast additional need for cotton, alfalfa, fruits, and vegetables.

It is true that my State of Wisconsin, as well as the rest of the Midwest, has benefited by the price support program. We are very sorry we have found these programs necessary. Democrats and Republicans, alike—farmers, particularly—regret very much the necessity for the price support program. Above all, we want to see programs supported by Congress which will eliminate the necessity for price support programs. We do not want programs which will force us to rely on price supports more in the future than has been the case in the past.

That is exactly what the bill proposes to do. The bill will greatly increase the production of food products which are in competition with similar products grown in Wisconsin, particularly alfalfa. There will be a further increase in the surplus of alfalfa and of milk. This will make it necessary for us to rely even more on price support programs, and we do not like them.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin regrets the necessary to have a price support program. I may say that we from the Far West regret the necessity to irrigate our arid uplands in order to make them productive. But Almighty God, in His infinite wisdom, did not cause enough precipitation in the form of rain or snowfall to occur there so as to permit agriculture in its natural state Therefore, it is necessary to have artificial reclamation in the form of canals and storage reservoirs.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if in the interest of economy he will offer an amendment to reduce the amount of Federal funds for price supports on dairy products.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I offered an amendment to the principal farm bill last year to do exactly that. I think it would have saved the Government an enormous amount of money. The proposal was supported by every dairy-producing organization in my State. This was a self-help bill which would have prevented dairy surpluses by self-regulation of production with adequate penalties. We favor that kind of action.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator favor eliminating price supports on corn and wheat?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not want to get into a discussion of that subject; it is an entirely different one. I think there ought to be a farm program which will eliminate the necessity for price supports by a limitation of farm production. But that is entirely aside from the point at issue.

My only difference with the Senator from Oregon is one of timing. I agree, certainly, that assistance should be provided for the reclamation and the irrigation of land in the Far West. I simply say that this is not the time to do a great deal more of it.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The area covered by the bill is already in agricultural production. This is not a matter of bringing new land into production; it is a question of changing the type of agriculture. Almost 200,000 acres are producing wheat there now, because it is necessary for the farmers to do dry-land farming, inasmuch as their wells go down from 600 to 2,000 feet. It is my assertion that by putting water on the land, this agricultural area will be transformed from one which produces price-supported wheat and cotton into one where non-price-supported products will be substituted. More melons, fruits, and vegetables will be grown to feed the millions of people who are coming to California. We simply cannot otherwise grow enough of such food to be consumed in the metropolitan centers.

So if the Senator from Wisconsin is arguing that we shall be bringing new land into production, I should say that he does not understand the point. We are not doing that. These lands are at present in production. We are trying to change the nature of the production, so that it will become non-price-supported production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The facts were specified by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They have not been challenged. He pointed out that there would be an enormous increase in cotton production and a tremendous increase in alfalfa. Alfalfa is not now supported, but it is directly related to the production of livestock and milk products, which are either in oversupply now or will be in oversupply in the near future.

It makes all the sense in the world that when this much water is put on the land, there will be an enormous increase in the agricultural income in this particular area, at a time when there is a surplus of food in America. Supply will increase further; price will drop. So the effect on the overall farm income will be harmful, will be deleterious, and the effect on the taxpayers will be even more so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to recommit the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—24

Aiken	Eastland	Russell
Beall	Ervin	Saltonstall
Bush	Frear	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Smith
Capehart	Lausche	Stennis
Case, N.J.	Prouty	Talmadge
Clark	Proxmire	Thurmond
Cotton	Robertson	Williams, Del.

NAYS—57

Anderson	Hart	McClellan
Bennett	Hartke	McNamara
Bible	Hayden	Magnuson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hennings	Mansfield
Carlson	Hill	Martin
Carroll	Holland	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Morton
Church	Humphrey	Moss
Curtis	Jackson	Mundt
Dirksen	Javits	Murray
Dodd	Johnston, S.C.	Muskie
Douglas	Jordan	Neuberger
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Engle	Kennedy	Randolph
Fulbright	Kerr	Smathers
Goldwater	Kuchel	Sparkman
Gore	Langer	Yarborough
Green	Long	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	McCarthy	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Cooper	O'Mahoney
Bartlett	Dworshak	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Symington
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Cannon	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Chavez	Monroney	

So the motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to recommit the bill was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 44) was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RESERVES REQUIRED TO BE MAINTAINED BY MEMBER BANKS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 185, Senate bill 1120, so that it may be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1120) to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, let me say that while this bill has been made the unfinished business, it will not be acted upon until tomorrow. It is my understanding that the introductory statement on behalf of the bill will be made by the chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

The remainder of the session today will be for the purpose of speeches, insertions in the RECORD, and things of that sort. There will be no more votes.

SAN LUIS UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the people of the country won a great victory this afternoon when section 6(a) of the San Luis bill was eliminated.

If this provision is not restored in the House of Representatives, it will mean that the big estates of California in the Central Valley, if they wish to secure the surface irrigation water, can be compelled to dissolve into smaller farms, and there will be a better basis of land ownership and cultivation in this great area.

Mr. President, I think the result of this vote indicates the importance of discussion and debate, because when the bill was brought to the floor on last Tuesday everything was apparently primed for its speedy passage. The committee, with one possible exception, had brought in a report advocating the bill with the inclusion of section 6(a). This provision was supported by the two very amiable, popular, and able Senators from California. The great majority of the membership did not know a great deal about the bill, and therefore was ready to approve it.

I must also admit that the two Senators who primarily took the floor to oppose the measure, the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Illinois, would probably never win any popularity contest among the Members of this body.

We had before us for consideration, therefore, a measure with everything in its favor.

The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois in the debates of last week and yesterday tried to develop the facts in this case, and I think we demonstrated to the satisfaction of those who listened and read the RECORD that, with section 6(a) in it, it was a bad bill.

There were only a few people who listened to the debates. At times it seemed to be a futile exercise. There were only a few people on the floor as we talked against what seemed to be overwhelming odds.

Yet the extraordinary thing is that as the facts were developed one could see the opinion of the Senate change. Senator after Senator took the floor to say he believed section 6(a) was a bad section and should be eliminated from the bill.

The analysis of the bill spread by a process of osmosis through the Senate as a whole, so that those who did not hear the debates nevertheless read the RECORD, or colleagues upon whom they relied relayed information to them. This afternoon it became pretty clear from the voice vote, and was made abundantly clear on the division vote which was taken, that it was the overwhelming opinion of the Senate that section 6(a) should be eliminated from the bill.

This was both a great victory for the people and also a demonstration of the value of discussion and debate. There has been too much of an idea, Mr. President, that important public matters should be settled off the floor, should be settled by secret arrangements, and that debate itself should be minimized and curtailed, being at best useless and at worst actually harmful.

I hope our experience in this debate will encourage other Senators from time to time, when they feel strongly about a measure and feel informed about that measure, to take the floor of the Senate and to express their convictions honestly and accurately. I hope, therefore, that this discussion may pave the way for something of a change in Senate procedure in this matter.

I also wish to pay tribute to the many people in California who, amidst discouragements and great pressures, have remained faithful to the ideal of a democratic system of ownership of land—humble men and women, farmers, laborers, scholars, and editors of small papers who have made great sacrifices.

I also wish to pay tribute to those who in the past have held up the ideal of the 160-acre limitation and the broad ownership of land, and who were punished for their convictions. These are people who have been boycotted and blacklisted in the valley and throughout California because of opinions which they have held. There are heroic public figures such as Helen Gahagan Douglas, who went down to political defeat in 1950 in part because she stood for this principle. These people perished along the wayside—in some cases physically and in other cases politically—but they

kept the spark of revolt against land monopoly alive. Without them the victory which was won this afternoon would not have been possible. I salute these men and these women. I thank them for all they have done. I pay tribute to them.

I also wish to thank the two Senators from Oregon, both the senior Senator and the junior Senator, for the magnificent help, assistance, and leadership they gave in this debate, which are really beyond praise.

I also wish to pay tribute, if I may, to the two Senators from California, the senior Senator and the junior Senator. We had a hard struggle. It was a vigorous fight, but the Senators from California fought fair and preserved throughout the personal friendliness and amiability we should all have in our relationship with those with whom we may disagree. I wish to say that on my part I have only the kindliest, warmest, and friendliest of feelings for both these fine Senators.

I believe that in its final form the measure, while it is costly, will probably in the long years ahead pay out, because the land is extremely fertile. I can only hope that the retention of the 160-acre limitation will prevail in the House and will be present in the final bill.

I wish to say to my good friends from California that if by any chance section 6(a) should reappear in the bill in any form the Senator from Illinois will fight the proposed bill, as he has stated, on the beaches, in the fields, and on the streets, to the very end.

I voted for the bill once section 6(a) had been eliminated. But if section 6(a) comes back into the bill, I believe it will be found that the Senator from Illinois, the Senators from Oregon, and other Senators will be quite vigorous in their opposition.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL ON NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] yesterday made a robust statement before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. I believe the statement is enlightening, and is worthy of a place in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL AT HEARING OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE DURING HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, MAY 11, 1959

Now that we are entering what I hope will be the final week of our hearings on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, I want to make a brief statement as ranking minority member on the way the committee has handled this nomination. Those of the minority with whom I have talked do not want our silence thus far to be taken as approval of or acquiescence in the extraordinarily hostile approach that has been taken toward the nominee in the name of our committee. Others may wish to make their own or supplementary remarks.

We Republicans are a minority of 6 on a committee having 17 members. We cannot control what is done in the name of our committee, but we can protest, and this I am now doing. In so doing, I recognize that there may be and likely are members of the majority who have neither authorized nor approved the conduct I condemn. Their influence should be helpful in bringing about much needed correction.

It was anticipated, of course, that the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss would not meet with universal acclaim. He is a strong-minded man who has for years carried the responsibility for decision in areas roamed by other strong-minded men. In particular, we were aware of his opponents among proponents of public power and the long-standing series of disagreements between the nominee and the present chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We thought it likely that Senators active in the Dixon-Yates inquiries as well as the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would want to oppose the Strauss nomination vigorously.

It does not seem appropriate to us that our committee be turned into a practice hall for the 1960 senatorial campaign or into an arena for the settlement of old grudges. Therefore, in behalf of the minority, I suggested to our committee chairman that we invite our Senate colleagues, if interested, to appear as witnesses before our committee or to submit questions through the chairman, but that we limit questioning of witnesses to members of our own committee and to properly designated members of the committee staff. Chairman MAGNUSON agreed and announced at an executive session of our committee that, without objection, such a course would be followed. Thereafter, letters to that effect went to all Senators.

It came as quite a surprise to the minority when a Senator not on this committee began his testimony by saying that he had not availed himself of the general invitation issued by our committee but had responded to a special invitation dated April 22, 1959, in which our chairman told him:

"I feel very strongly that it is important to our consideration of this nomination that you appear and outline for our committee the record of Mr. Strauss' dealings with the Joint Committee and lend us the benefit of your opinions with regard to the important questions raised in connection with this nominee."

The minority members were not advised that any such letter had gone out. It has had these consequences that could have been anticipated and should have been avoided: A Senator not a member of our committee has dominated our public hearings, sat with the members of our committee, vicariously cross-examined the nominee, and, behind the scenes, has participated in planning an examination of a kind wholly inappropriate to our purposes. It would be appropriate at all only if Mr. Strauss were being considered for another term on the Atomic Energy Commission. We deplore this usurpation. It should have been resisted by the majority.

Normally, nominations referred to our committee are handled with the assistance of the regular committee staff. However, after slightly earlier oral notice to me, the other minority members learned on April 8, through a committee press release, that an attorney had been hired by the committee as special counsel for the Strauss hearings. Later, an assistant was hired for the special counsel, but no press release was issued and his presence on the staff came to public knowledge only when he was mentioned during the hearings as having custody of some Civil Aeronautics Board files which the nominee had been seeking to examine in order to prepare rebuttal testimony.

The chairman's private office adjoining the Commerce Committee's quarters has been turned over to the special counsel, and there, almost half a city block away from the room which the minority clerk and the minority counsel share with others of the committee staff, people come and go who are zealous to block the confirmation of Secretary Strauss. While any intent to act in secret is now denied, the practical reality is that the minority members of this committee have been kept in the dark and the office of special counsel, under some urging unknown to us, has become the office of special prosecutor.

We of the minority concede that a more timely protest on our part could have averted some of the matters of which we complain. We explain our tardiness on three grounds: The natural reluctance of each of us to place any restriction on any other Senator, our desire to avoid emphasizing partisanship in the consideration of this nomination, and our hope that correction would come in due course from the majority.

There are some signs that this is now beginning to happen. Objection has been voiced on the majority side to the latitude allowed witnesses in stating undocumented opinions, and just last Saturday, special counsel offered to open to minority inspection such unsolicited communications from outside the Senate as have been sent to the committee or its chairman with respect to the pending nomination.

It is not too late to get this matter firmly back on the track. As the record stands, a few events in the long public life of the nominee have been singled out for an inordinate amount of attention. They are all past history. Historians, not this committee, will have to decide as to each event who was right and who wrong, or whether under the pressure of strong emotions mountains were made of molehills.

In our view, the majority members of this committee have the responsibility for correcting the distortions that have entered the record of these hearings. Theirs is the responsibility so to conduct the hearings that exhumed controversies outside this committee's jurisdiction will not becloud or crowd out testimony relevant to the nominee's fitness for the post to which he has been named. It is the majority's responsibility to protect the nominee against demands that he show more than mortal skill in remembering and describing events long past, and more than mortal patience when attacks on his truthfulness and integrity are dignified and endlessly repeated.

It is up to the majority to conduct these hearings in a climate in which it becomes easy to recognize that truth does not spring automatically from the lips of the accuser and falsehood automatically from the lips of the accused. Most important of all, it is up to the majority to reclaim effective control of these proceedings, to restore dignity to them, and to push them to an early conclusion.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, supplementing the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on Monday on the new unemployment statistics just released by the Labor Department, I should like to add

that an employed labor force of 65 million for April is an all-time high for that month. The increase in employment by 1.2 million in April as compared with March is very impressive. With it unemployment was down by 735,000 last month. That leaves a total unemployed force of 3.6 million, or 5.3 percent of the employed total.

Both the drop in unemployment and the increase in employment is double the seasonal expectations. These figures should inspire confidence in the vitality of our economy and also in the national administration.

By this I do not mean to say that with an unemployed force of 3,600,000 we should be complacent or that the battle is entirely won. The Eisenhower administration is dedicated to a strong national economy founded on right policies and this program will continue.

One more observation is in order. It is quite clear that Secretary Mitchell will not have to eat his hat. At the AFL–CIO Jobless Conference in Washington in April, Secretary Mitchell stated his conviction that unemployment would be down to 3 million and employment up to 67 million by October. We are in the month of May and if nothing more than normal seasonal increases occur between now and October, the unemployed will drop to 2.8 million and the employed will increase to a figure of 67 million. It is quite certain that Secretary Mitchell will not be called upon to eat his chapeau.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

U.S. DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a statement appeared in the House hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 which relates to the U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

The chairman of the subcommittee addressed a question to the budget officer of the Department of Justice based on a report by the House Judiciary Committee with reference to the conduct of Robert Tieken, the U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois. The question related to what had been done by the Attorney General with reference to the conclusions and recommendations in that report, to which the Attorney General provided the following information:

Mr. CELLER's letter transmitting the report was received in the Department on August 27, 1958. Careful consideration has been given to its conclusions and recommendations. Mr. Tieken's term expired March 17, 1958. The person to succeed him has not yet been recommended to the President, but such a recommendation for another person will be made in the very near future.

I have been queried concerning this statement since the hearings became public. More than 5 years ago I submitted Mr. Tieken's name for U.S. attorney, because I deemed he would be competent, courageous and vigorous in carrying out his duties in a very sensitive office.

I have known Mr. Tieken for 25 years, and when I submitted his name I was more than confident that he would perform the duties of the office in a satisfactory way and bring to the people within the jurisdiction of that office the kind of vigorous law enforcement which they expected and to which they are entitled.

Nothing has arisen in all the intervening years to change my mind regarding his integrity and ability. The record achieved by him and his associates in that office is unexcelled in any area of the Nation. I have submitted no other name to replace him nor have I asked him to resign. I expect him to continue in that office and to conduct it in the same capable fashion which he has done in the past.

PANAMA DANGER ZONE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, for more than a decade I have followed interoceanic canal problems closely and made many statements thereon in and out of the Congress, particularly with respect to the question of canal defense and Isthmian Canal policy. These matters are now being studied by a board of consultants under the direction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

Thus, it was most gratifying to read in the May 9, 1959, issue of the Saturday Evening Post a highly informative article on the canal question by Demaree Bess, one of its distinguished contributing editors specializing in foreign affairs. I commend it for readng by all Members of the Congress and other agencies of the Federal Government concerned with canal matters.

To make this article more readily available, I ask unanimous consent to place significant portions of it at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, May 9, 1959]

THE PANAMA DANGER ZONE

(By Demaree Bess)

(The celebrated canal is still one of our vulnerable lifelines—and now the Panamanians are making things really difficult.)

The Panama Canal was the subject of the first full-length speech in the new 86th Congress, made last January 9 in the House by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, veteran Democrat from Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Recognized by many as an authority on his subject, Representative FLOOD warned the House that a situation has developed which threatens to make the Panama Canal "another Berlin" on our southern doorstep. He explained that this threat arises from a very slick law passed by the little Republic of Panama last December which enables its government to control access to the canal by water both from the Pacific and Atlantic—Caribbean—sides in the same way Russia controls access by land to Berlin.

The new law extends Panama's sovereignty over its coastal waters from the traditional 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit, and thus asserts control over a 9-mile stretch of ocean between both canal terminals and the open seas. This was made possible by a loophole in the 1903 canal treaty which restricted U.S. jurisdiction to 3 sea miles from each terminal—that was enough in 1903 to assure access to the open seas.

Representative FLOOD told the House that this is only one of many recent moves by Panamanian nationalists and politicians to undermine U.S. control of the canal. He added, "This is a matter that cannot safely be ignored.

"We must not permit the creation of another Berlin at this artery of world commerce."

However, other Members of Congress did ignore his warning. Not one of them publicly commented on his speech, and it did not get a single line in Washington and New York newspapers which specialize in foreign news. But on the same day that Congressman FLOOD addressed the House for 30 minutes, the State Department sent a note to the Government of Panama protesting the new law and expressing the hope that the Republic would "find it possible to reconsider its action." Four days later Panama's National Assembly unanimously rejected this request for reconsideration, which meant that the matter was deadlocked unless and until some overt act occurred.

Now, minor crises between our Government and the Republic of Panama over issues connected with the Panama Canal are nothing new—there have been a good many of them through the years. But it is doubtful whether any crisis has been as acute as the current one. A potentially explosive situation has been set up which would compel a showdown between the United States and Panama if the latter government ever attempted to enforce its sovereignty to the waters in question. Representative FLOOD's Berlin analogy has dramatized the situation although, of course, the power factors are not comparable. Panama is not a military power and has virtually no navy.

Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated time and again recently that the actions of very small nations can have far-reaching effects upon great powers. So it is worth noting that the Republic of Panama's challenge to the United States, though generally ignored in this country, was treated as one of the major news events of the year in Panama. For days on end it was reported under banner headlines in both English- and Spanish-language newspapers there.

Last January 13 the fifty-odd members of Panama's Assembly voted unanimously to give Congressman FLOOD the formal title of Panama's "Public Enemy No. 1," although Representative FLOOD had pointed out in his January speech that he was not the first to compare the Panama Canal's present predicament with the Berlin situation. That comparison originated in a Panama City newspaper owned and edited by former President Harmodio Arias, of Panama.

The situation in Panama will not evaporate merely because the American press generally has ignored it. The 12-mile law was a planned move in a lengthy campaign by Panamanian nationalists to reinforce their claim to sovereignty in the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone through which the canal was cut. Panama's politicians are frankly interested in using the canal to get more revenue from the United States. Extreme nationalists have more far-reaching ambitions. They proclaim their intention eventually to nationalize it as Egypt did the Suez Canal.

This is the situation which worries Representative FLOOD, who has been fascinated by the Panama Canal since he first traversed it in 1918, when he was 15 years old. He has followed its affairs closely ever since, and he recently urged the Saturday Evening Post to make an independent study of its present predicament. I was assigned to do that. After many weeks of research, I have reached conclusions somewhat different from Mr.

FLOOD'S, but I do not think he has exaggerated the potential dangers.

* * * * *

A brief review of the canal's history is necessary to understand today's complications. The U.S. role in the story divides rather sharply into two distinct parts, each dominated by a Roosevelt. Theodore Roosevelt looms large in the early part, while Franklin D. Roosevelt initiated the current part.

The American Government decided to construct the canal only after the French builders of the Suez Canal had tried and failed. The Frenchmen discovered to their sorrow that the Panama project was infinitely more difficult than Suez, and they lost fortunes before finally abandoning the attempt. President Theodore Roosevelt then became enthusiatic about the project in 1902. Although a majority in the Senate favored a route through Nicaragua, T.R. plumped for Panama. His administration first negotiated a liberal treaty with Colombia, which then governed the Isthmus of Panama as a province. But the treaty got mixed up with Colombia's domestic politics. Colombia's congress adjourned in 1903 without ratifying it, despite the repeated warning of the Colombian negotiator in Washington, Tomá Herrán, that the delay would mean either the loss of the canal to Nicaragua or would provoke T.R. into backing Panamanian revolutionaries, who had made several previous attempts to secede from Colombia.

Theodore Roosevelt wasted no time in making that prediction come true. Only a few days after the Colombian Congress adjourned, the Republic of Panama was proclaimed, and T.R.'s administration immediately recognized the new government and guaranteed its independence. In return the revolutionaries accepted a treaty which was much more favorable to the United States than the Colombian treaty had been. The envoy who represented the revolutionaries in negotiations for the 1903 treaty was not a Panamanian but a brilliant French engineer, Phillippe Bunau-Varilla, who was eager to salvage his large share of the defunct French New Panama Canal Co.'s stock, which the United States had agreed to buy if the canal went through Panama.

This highly irregular procedure more than a half a century ago figures prominently in today's claims by Panamanian nationalists. It explains why some Panamanians are still grateful to Theodore Roosevelt and why many are not. The grateful ones recognize T.R. as one of the Republic's founding fathers. They agree that if he had not acted as he did the canal almost certainly would have been built through Nicaragua, so that today's world shipping would bypass Panama. Ungrateful Panamanians argue that T.R. cheated Panama when, by underwriting Panama's independence, he obtained a more favorable treaty than he had previously offered Colombia. This is the basis of nationalist demands for sovereignty in the Canal Zone and an immediate split in the canal's receipts.

The Theodore Roosevelt period in United States-Panama relations lasted three decades. Then Franklin D. Roosevelt initiated drastic changes in 1933. During the T.R. period the Republic of Panama was an American protectorate, defended by American troops and profiting from business the canal brought. The 553 square miles of the Canal Zone became a strongly fortified American-style outpost, governed from Washington as an outfit wholly concerned with operating the canal efficiently. During these three decades Panamanians more or less gracefully consented to be beneficiaries of the canal tolls. But nationalist emotions were growing. During a visit to Washington in 1933 Panama's President Harmodio Arias persuaded Franklin D. Roosevelt that it was time to terminate the protectorate and relinquish special American treaty rights in Panama outside the Canal Zone. These included the authority to pre-empt land for military purposes, to control sanitation and public health and to conduct enterprises designed to make the canal more efficient.

F.D.R. gave up these treaty rights. When he did so, he underestimated the opposition of American military leaders and the Senate. The promises he made, although hailed with tremendous enthusiasm in Panama, were so vigorously resisted in Washington that 6 years of negotiation and debate followed before our Senate ratified a revised treaty in 1939. This lengthy delay between pledge and fulfillment caused much ill-feeling in Panama, and the revisions left American military leaders still unhappy about the canal's defenses. When World War II broke out, their misgivings were confirmed. By that time Panama had a president openly hostile to the United States, and not until Pearl Harbor did the Panama Government agree to lease land outside the Canal Zone for military bases—and then only for the duration. Immediately after World War II ended, agitation against the American bases became so intense that half of the leases were canceled in 1945, the rest in 1948. American Armed Forces were thereafter confined to the narrow confines of the Canal Zone.

Thus American hopes that concessions to the Republic of Panama would reduce friction over the canal have not been fulfilled. Since F.D.R. initiated major treaty revisions, many additional concessions have been made, but nationalist agitation for a greater voice in the canal's affairs has increased. Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956 added fuel to Panamanian flames. International Communism has not overlooked this opportunity to aggravate tensions in a vulnerable area. From the Communist viewpoint, it would be foolish not to make the most of unrest in Panama and the Canal Zone, which can simultaneously weaken American control of this strategically and commercially vital waterway and damage U.S. relations with Latin Americans.

But, in my opinion, Congressman FLOOD has overstressed Communist influence, which thus far has been more potential than real. A much more serious threat, I believe, lies in Washington's failure to make a sharp distinction between the two entities which are uneasy neighbors in the Isthmus of Panama—the Republic of Panama and the American-administered Canal Zone. For all practical purposes the Canal Zone and the Republic resemble two separate countries. Yet ever since 1933 their affairs have been increasingly scrambled. This has come about because so many different segments of the American Government have had some kind of finger in the Panama Canal pie. These include the White House, both houses of Congress, all three branches of the armed services and at least a dozen other governmental departments and agencies. For a quarter of a century these multiple Washington authorities have been unable to reconcile their views about whether the Canal Zone and the canal are exclusively U.S. enterprises or whether the Republic of Panama has a joint interest in them.

For example, Presidents Truman and Eisenhower both have contributed personally to the existing uncertainty in Washington about the canal's status. In 1945 President Truman shocked almost everybody directly concerned with the canal when, at the Potsdam Conference, he proposed that the Panama Canal be internationalized along with other waterways in world commerce. That proposal got nowhere only because Joseph Stalin flatly rejected it. Apparently Mr. Truman still does not realize that Stalin saved him from an embarrassing predicament, because his proposal would have been as bitterly opposed by almost all Panamanians as it would have been by U.S. Armed Forces and the Senate. Only last November 30, Mr. Truman defended his Potsdam proposal on Edward R. Murrow's television program, "Small World." The former British Prime Minister, Lord Attlee, also was on that program, and one interchange went as follows:

"Mr. MURROW. Lord Attlee seems to believe that some of the trouble spots, including Formosa, ought to be internationalized. How do you feel about that, Mr. President (Truman)? I seem to remember that you suggested as far back as 1945 at Potsdam that certain areas should be internationalized, including, I believe, the Suez Canal.

"Mr. TRUMAN. Yes, I did. And the Rhine-Danube Canal, the Kiel Canal, the Panama Canal. All those waterways and the Bosporus, too, ought to be internationally controlled, and then there wouldn't be any trouble over them.

"Mr. ATTLEE. Yes, I remember very well your putting that forward at Potsdam, and I agreed with you entirely.

"Mr. TRUMAN. You certainly did, and we tried our best to get some action on it, but the Russians wouldn't agree to it."

One illogical result of President Truman's proposal was to encourage Panamanian nationalists, although most of them are more vigorously opposed to internationalizing the canal than most Americans are. They proclaim, "The canal is ours," and cite Mr. Truman's lumping together of Panama and Suez to support their claims. However, the status of these two canals is wholly different. The Suez Canal was built by a private company on leased Egyptian territory, under a contract providing reversionary rights to the Egyptian Government. The Panama Canal was built by the U.S. Government in a Canal Zone which the United States was empowered to govern in perpetuity "as if it were the sovereign." But if an American President doesn't recognize any difference, Panamanians can hardly be blamed for equal misunderstanding.

Soon after President Eisenhower assumed office in 1953 he sought to improve our relations with Panama by personal diplomacy. Unfortunately this well-meant attempt has further scrambled the affairs of the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama. In September 1953, President José Remón of Panama paid a state visit to Washington, getting red-carpet treatment. When he went home President Remón, who was later assassinated, told cheering crowds in Panama City about his visit. He said that Mr. Eisenhower greeted him as a friend, and the two Presidents quickly agreed to issue a joint statement approving a principle eagerly supported by Panamanian nationalists. This was the principle that "the two nations which made possible the construction of the canal" should benefit equally from it.

According to Panamanian newspaper reports at the time, President Remón declared that just before a state dinner given for him by Secretary Dulles "a little bureaucrat from the State Department brought over a joint statement which was not the same thing at all" as the visitor wanted. "So before the dinner," Remón told his cheering supporters. "I told Mr. Eisenhower that I could not drink with him until we signed the right statement. He read the one that had been sent me and agreed it was not right. So in a corner of the banquet room the President dictated to Secretary Dulles—who used his knee for a desk"—the communique which was made public. The generalized principle thus proclaimed is the basis for the current nationalist campaign demanding a 50–50 split in the canal's gross revenues, which amounted in fiscal 1958 to $83,100,000. Of course, any such split would mean that the Panama Canal Company would be compelled either to increase tolls already considered high or operate at a heavy loss.

With so many points of friction unresolved, the Panama Canal is approaching one of the most critical periods in its history. The canal is partially obsolescent, and costly changes will be required to bring it up to date. So the American Government must soon make both technical and political decisions about the canal. The technical problems are being studied by a group of experts who were appointed in November 1957 by Congress to investigate the future of transisthmian waterways, not only in Panama but also in "alternate locations in the isthmus." The group will report some time this summer. The results of their studies will not be revealed before they are submitted to the Congress, but two of their conclusions can be confidently predicted:

1. The Panama Canal can be modernized at a fraction of the cost of any new transisthmian canal, and can have the capacity to handle probable traffic increases at least until the end of this century. According to an estimate by the Stanford Research Institute, increase in cargo volume will not exceed 73 percent by 1975, and 136 percent by the year 2000. So no new canal is technically necessary.

2. The Panama Canal's approaching obsolescence is due to the fact that ships have become much larger than its builders anticipated, so that many are handled with difficulty, and some huge tankers and warships cannot get through at all. Two schemes have been proposed to solve this deficiency. One is a sea-level canal; the other is the so-called locks-terminal lake system. The latter would adopt the present canal, in which ships are lifted in three steps to a fresh-water lake 85 feet above sea level. The proposed modification would widen some cuts and build a terminal lake on the Pacific side. A sea-level canal admittedly would cost several times the terminal-lake scheme—as much as $10 billion—and the chief argument in its favor has been that it offers greater protection from attack. But that argument has lost much of its force because almost all experts now agree that any kind of waterway could not be locally defended in a nuclear war. Today the only real importance of local defense in the Canal Zone is against sabotage. So the technical consultants are almost certain to recommend the locks-terminal lake system.

To sum up, this means the Panama Canal can be modernized to meet the needs of world shipping at least to the end of this century at reasonable cost to the United States and at no cost to Panama. There is just one major obstacle to this project, and that is the political uncertainty in United States-Panama relations.

An illustration of the potential danger occurred last February, when an accidental coincidence brought Panama briefly into the news. The United States conducted long-planned maneuvers designed to show that the Panama Canal can be best defended by bringing paratroopers from distant bases. About 2,000 Americans from Carolina bases were dropped at Rio Hato, the only maneuvering ground in the isthmus which Americans still have treaty rights to use. Almost at the same moment riots broke out in Panama City, the Republic's capital, which adjoins the Canal Zone. These riots were wholly concerned with domestic politics, but a few nationalist agitators did their best to connect them with demands for more power in the zone and with the American maneuvers—fortunately with little success. But this episode underlined the need to determine unmistakably the Canal Zone's political status before the American Government commits further large-scale expenditure on the canal.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Cliff R. Johnson, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

We remember, O God, how our Lord Jesus has said, "Ask, and it will be given unto you, seek and you will find; knock and it will be opened unto you."—Matthew 7: 7.

We ask for Thy wisdom, O God, we seek Thy guidance, we stand knocking that we may receive of Thy infinite grace. With Thy wisdom, Thy guidance, and Thy grace, we can make this a good day for our Nation and for ourselves.

Grant that all that transpires within this Chamber this day may serve to make for understanding, for compassion, for brotherhood, and for peace. This we pray for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to defer the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1960 crop of wheat until June 1, 1959.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF THE BELGIANS

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Majesty the King of the Belgians, into the Chamber, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. RABAUT; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURLESON; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice of the United States and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Majesty the King of the Belgians.

His Majesty the King of the Belgians, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it gives me great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to welcome into this Chamber the leader of a great, a proud, and a free people, and a people who are friendly to the United States of America.

I present the King of the Belgians. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY, THE KING OF THE BELGIANS

The KING OF THE BELGIANS. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I who am a young man come from a country old enough to have been spoken of proudly by Julius Caesar.

I come to a country which for centuries God kept hidden behind a veil until its appointed hour when it took into its young arms, the people of the Old World.

America has been called a melting pot, but it seems better to call it a mosaic, for in it each nation, people, and race which has come to its shores has been privileged to keep its individuality, contributing, at the same time, its share to the unified pattern of a new nation. [Applause.]

I rejoice in the honor given to me by this assembly, an honor which deeply moves the hearts of the Belgian people. After all, your country and mine have

much in common. [Applause.] In both, the state exists for the people, not the people for the state. [Applause.] In both, rights and liberties take their origin, not in the government, but as your Declaration of Independence states, in the unalienable rights given by the Creator.

Time has not dimmed the gratitude of my people for the sympathetic attitude and practical help from America in World War I. It was the American Commission for Relief formed by Brand Whitlock under the Presidency of Herbert Hoover, which saved the population of Belgium from the horrors of starvation. The hunger we then had for bread is now a hunger to be everlastingly grateful for that great work of mercy.

Permit me also to register justifiable pride in recalling that it was upon our Belgian soil in the last war that General MacAuliff wrote the shortest and most unforgettable diplomatic note ever sent in wartime. [Applause.] As you all know it, I shall not tax your memory by repeating it. [Laughter.]

Since that day, the name of Bastogne has ever been cherished in our minds. The graves of your gallant soldiers are now part of our sacred soil. Their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

When my great uncle, the late King Leopold II, undertook with Stanley his bold adventure of bringing civilization into the unexplored regions of central Africa, the United States—through Congress—was the first Government to proclaim the humanitarian nature of this great enterprise, and to recognize the independent state of the Congo as a friendly Government.

During the 75 years that have followed, Belgium has done her utmost to bring to the Congo security and a more human life.

Today all my countrymen join in the desire to raise the population of Congo to a level that will enable them freely to choose their future destiny. As soon as they are matured, as soon as they have received the loving care in education that we can give them, we shall launch them forth on their own enterprise and independent existence. [Applause.]

There are two other points, ladies and gentlemen, for which I crave your indulgence: the first is on peace, the second on youth.

Peace, as you know, is the tranquillity of order. Mere tranquillity can be cold war, but the tranquillity of order implies justice.

Perhaps never before has peace been so difficult to achieve as it is today. At other periods, the possibility of war endangered our homelands and our homes. Today war endangers our minds and our hearts. The older imperialism sought the conquest of lands; the new seeks the mastery of intellects.

The peace for which we have to labor is not just to preserve our possessions, but our very personalities.

The preservation of peace has, therefore, become in our day, the work not only of the heads of governments, but of the entire citizenry of every nation. Since it is not only our bodies but also our minds that are at stake, peace is made from two directions: one from the conference table to the people, the other from the people to the conference table. And as the differences between governments often are greater than the differences between peoples, the peace within our hearts is the greatest guarantee of peace in the world. [Applause.]

I am here to register the solidarity between the peoples of Belgium and America [applause] in the fond hope that all human beings, wherever they be, may join with us in the prayer of your great Lincoln that government of the people, for the people, and by the people may not perish from the earth. [Applause.]

A word about youth.

Youth is the first victim of war, the first fruit of peace. It takes 20 years or more of peace to make a man; it takes only 20 seconds of war to destroy him.

In a certain sense America is the land of youth, because it dedicates more of its energies, talents, money, and science to the birth and preservation of life than any other country in the world. [Applause.]

Where better can the free peoples of the world look for the averting of war and death than to your Nation so vibrant with the love of life? It is unthinkable that those who spend so much to save life would ever seek to destroy it. Even the money spent on the defense of peace we see as a deterrent to those who would endanger human life.

Not only I, but all the youths of my country, most willingly adhere to your reverence for life. Nor shall our confidence in you be misplaced, for what is written on your coins, I have read in the hearts of the American people: "In God we trust." [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m., His Majesty the King of the Belgians, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 94 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma to give the House some explanation of this resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. Under existing law, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Maine, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to proclaim marketing quotas and national allotments for wheat on May 15. All this resolution does is to postpone until June 1 that requirement of law.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask why that is done?

Mr. ALBERT. The Senate has sent over this resolution. Both the Senate and the House committees are hoping to bring out new legislation prior to the proclamation of the quota. That is the reason for the resolution.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall defer until June 1, 1959—

(1) any proclamation under section 332 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to a national acreage allotment for the 1960 crop of wheat; and

(2) any proclamation under section 335 of such Act with respect to marketing quotas for such crop of wheat.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5916) making supplemental appropriations for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, KIRWAN, ROONEY, BOLAND, CANNON, JENSEN, BOW, JONAS, and TABER.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 5916 may have until midnight, Wednesday, May 13, in which to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Thursday next to file a report, including minority, individual, and supplemental views, on the bill H.R. 7086 to extend the Renegotiation Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LAKE MENDOCINO

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2193) to designate the Coyote Valley Reservoir in California as Lake Mendocino.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the body of water created by the Coyote Valley Dam in Mendocino County, California, and known as the "Coyote Valley Reservoir" shall hereafter be known and designated as "Lake Mendocino". Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such body of water is designated or referred to under and by the name of "Coyote Valley Reservoir" shall be held and considered to refer to such body of water under and by the name of "Lake Mendocino".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders heretofore entered on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], for tomorrow, may be postponed until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELIGIBILITY FOR DISABILITY BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House of Representatives legislation to eliminate the requirement that a person must be 50 years of age before he is eligible for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. Under the present law no one is eligible for disability insurance benefits until he or she is 50 years of age. To me, this restriction makes little sense. The breadwinner who has the misfortune of being disabled at age 30 or 40 needs the money then, when his family is growing up. It seems heartless as well as senseless to make him wait 10 or 20 years to qualify under an arbitrary age limit. My bill would permit such an employee to file immediately for benefits to which he is rightfully entitled, thus assisting him in some measure to contribute to the support of his dependents, in preventing his absolute dependency on others.

I believe we Members of Congress must look to the welfare of all our citizens whether they are young or old, able or disabled. If it becomes necessary to change some of our programs to meet the challenge of the changing times then this we must do.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to give every possible consideration to the enactment of my bill.

DAVIS-BACON ACT MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, good laws are often left behind by the march of events. New circumstances that could not be anticipated, and therefore are not covered by the law, make it impossible for the law to carry out its original intent.

Under these conditions, it becomes necessary to modernize the law so that it will function properly.

Back in 1931, the Davis-Bacon Prevailing Wage Act was enacted. It established the basic principle that no public tax money should be used to undermine prevailing wages. Before this law went into effect, private contractors paying lower wages, had underbid other contractors paying the going rate. This had the effect of depressing wage standards and weakening the position of organized labor in the construction industry. As this was taking place on construction initiated by direct spending on the part of the Federal Government, it resulted in the Government becoming responsible for this cut-wage competition. The Davis-Bacon Act eliminated that contradiction.

New programs developed since 1931, to cope with the depression first, and then with the complex problems of our dynamic economy, have brought about situations beyond the coverage of the Davis-Bacon Act.

As most of the Federal spending on construction today is of an indirect nature, through the medium of Federal grants-in-aid, Federal loans, Federal insured loans, or Federal guaranteed loans, there are loopholes where the enabling legislation fails to specify that the end contractor along this circuitous route shall come within the reach of the Davis-Bacon Act. The original Prevailing Wage Act did not make provision for the health and welfare plans, the vacation plans, and the apprenticeship-training plans that have since become a part of fair labor standards, supported by contractor payments. Wages alone do not tell the whole story. Fringe benefits are now an integral part of the return due to the worker for his share in the productive effort and achievement.

Construction companies that do not yet provide such benefits for their employees, have an unfair competitive advantage over the majority of construction companies that cooperate with union building tradesmen to insure that the workers will be protected by health and welfare plans. This situation becomes intolerable when it involves Government contracts.

The Davis-Bacon Act must be brought up-to-date in order to overcome the defects and evasions that have been revealed since 1931 and to make certain that the original act will fulfill its purpose today.

H.R. 4362 and its companion bills in both the House and the Senate have four major objections:

First. To broaden the coverage of the present act.

Second. To require the Secretary of Labor to predetermine, and the Government contractors to pay, not only the prevailing hourly rate as presently specified in the Davis-Bacon Act, but also the prevailing contractor payments to health and welfare funds, retirement funds, vacation funds, and apprenticeship funds.

Third. To put hours of work and overtime on a prevailing basis.

Fourth. To centralize enforcement, and to create a construction appeals board.

Union building tradesmen, through collective bargaining, have won through to standards that have the approval and support of the general public. The proposed amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act will guarantee that the Federal Gov-

ernment, in its spending of public tax money, will never even through neglect, become a party to the weakening of local labor conditions.

This legislation will help to protect the legitimate progress of organized labor from the undermining tactics of the few irresponsible contractors.

INEQUITIES IN EXCISE TAX ON LAWNMOWERS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, American homeowners are cutting a wider swath these days. They are finding a degree of economy in buying wider lawnmowers. This just goes to show how ridiculous our Federal excise tax structure has become.

If I fail to make myself clear, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the increased production of king-sized 24-inch power lawnmowers which are exempt from our Topsy-like taxes while the perspiring owner of a 23-inch mower must pay a 5-percent excise on his purchase.

It is one more example of the willy-nilly tax discrimination imposed upon the American consumer who has to pay a 10-percent tax on his automobile which is a necessity, while his neighbor pays no such tax on a yacht.

This lawnmower inconsistency goes back to a 1951 law putting a 5-percent tax on power mowers "of the household type," whatever that means. Could it have been intended that a mower used to cut your yard should be taxed, but not a mower used on a golf course?

Confronted with such an obviously impossible determination, the Treasury Department had to make a regulation separating the household from the industrial mowers, and decided that mowers with a cutting width of 24 inches or more were industrial, and hence tax free, since the power mowers for home use at that time were substantially smaller.

But, with automation whirling around in every front yard, the 17-inch home mower gave way to the 19-inch mower, and the 19-inch mower gave way to 21- and 22-inch mower, and then, naturally, came the tax-exempt 24-inch mower.

The result is wholesale confusion. Some manufacturers have gone to the 24-inch mower, the rest are wondering whether they should to meet competition, and the Treasury Department is studying whether to broaden the definition of household type mowers, or, perhaps, to disregard the distinction and apply the tax to all power mowers.

I cannot conceive of a more ridiculous situation, Mr. Speaker, than to have a Federal excise tax on one lawnmower that cuts grass and no such tax on another mower that also cuts grass, but has a blade an inch wider. To me, this shows how our excise tax laws are completely out of focus with our economy. We could, of course, continue to cut our grass tax-free by using hand mowers.

This is a ludicrous situation, and points up once again the urgent need for a complete revision to eliminate discrimination, injustice, and the inconsistencies of our patchwork system of Federal excise taxes. Again, I urge my colleagues of the Ways and Means Committee to direct their attention to this essential task.

SPEECH OF THE KING OF THE BELGIANS TO THE CONGRESS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the very beautiful, extremely moving speech just delivered in the House of Representatives of His Majesty, the young King of Belgium, will go down in history as one of the most remarkable, dedicated speeches of any person of another country in all the history of the United States Congress. Although every inch a king, he has the human or the common touch. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that a copy of that speech could be put in every classroom, in every school in the United States for the youth of the country, to whom it was primarily addressed, and that recordings could be made of it and played, again and again, in every school and institution over our great land. The appreciation and understanding of the King of Belgium will show the youth of America that a king has sympathy for the great price they pay for patriotism. It is good for them to know in these difficult days.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1959—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for transfer of certain functions from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior now have responsibilities with respect to certain land or timber exchanges and land sales involving Federal lands. Also, the Department of the Interior is responsible for the use and disposal of mineral materials from acquired lands which are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. By placing certain functions pertinent to these matters in the Department which administers the lands, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 will bring about simplification of the work of the two Departments relating to such matters, more expeditious and economical performance of such work, and clarification of responsibilities concerning the work.

The exchange act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, authorizes the exchange of national forest land or timber for other lands within the boundaries of the national forests. The national forests are administered by the Department of Agriculture. Under this law and the seven other land exchange statutes cited, the Secretary of the Interior must make determinations as to whether a transaction is in the public interest, must review and accept titles, and adjudicate appeals. With exceptions indicated in the transmitted reorganization plan, including exceptions with respect to the issuance of patents to lands, the plan provides for the transfer of the functions of the Secretary of the Interior under these exchange statutes to the Secretary of Agriculture, who administers the national forests. The Secretary of the Interior also has the responsibility under the act of April 28, 1930 (46 Stat. 257) to reconvey lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture not accepted in exchange transactions. These functions either are duplications of those performed by the Department of Agriculture or can be more easily performed by that Department as it administers the lands involved and has detailed information and records.

The Tongass Timber Act of August 8, 1947 (61 Stat. 920) authorizes the sale of tracts of national forest land found reasonably necessary for the processing of timber from the Tongass National Forest. Under the act, the Secretary of the Interior must appraise and sell such lands, with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture administers the land involved, has personnel on the ground, and can perform this function most expeditiously and economically.

Section 10 of the Weeks law of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 962) authorizes sale of small tracts of acquired national forest land found chiefly valuable for agriculture. Under the act the Secretary of the Interior must join in the promulgation of joint regulations. Such lands are administered by the Department of Agriculture and sale of them is not related to programs of the Department of the Interior. This function can be most easily and economically performed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture can dispose of common varieties of sand, gravel, stone, pumice, and other materials from lands reserved from the public domain which are under his jurisdiction. With respect to these materials in acquired lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture such disposal must be by the Secretary of the Interior. The reorganization plan will place in the Secretary of Agriculture the same authority in regard to such materials in acquired lands under his jurisdiction as he now exercises for other lands. Such activity

most efficiently and economically can be performed by the Secretary of Agriculture in conjunction with other management activities on lands he administers.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 12, 1959.*

PERMISSIBLE WRITING AND PRINTING ON THIRD- AND FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the present postal rate law medical prescriptions which carry handwritten or typewritten directions as to their use, usually by attached gummed labels, are subject to the first-class postage rate while patent medicines which carry printed directions as to their use also on gummed labels are entitled to third- or fourth-class rate of postage. This appears to me to be a capricious distinction.

Today many medicines other than "patented medicines" are mailed to the patients. To people of longstanding illnesses the cost of first-class postage becomes a real item of expense of necessity added to the cost of the medicine.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to correct this inequity. This bill will allow medicines to go third- and fourth-class mail where the written material in the package is simply the instructions for the use of the medicine.

RED POWER IN CUBA HELD EXAGGERATED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Jules Dubois, veteran and distinguished Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, knows a lot about Cuba. He has studied it for a long time and he has studied the Castro revolution more minutely than any other man. His book, "Fidel Castro—Liberator or Dictator?" is one indication of his work in this field.

The following gives some facts which should be considered very carefully in connection with reports like that of Stuart Novins on CBS-TV network on Sunday, May 3:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 7, 1959]

RED POWER IN CUBA HELD EXAGGERATED
(By Jules Dubois, Chicago Tribune Press Service)

HAVANA.—Charges that the Communists are taking power under Premier Fidel Castro and occupy key posts in the Cuban army, press, radio, schools and unions are not supported by facts. There is Communist infiltration, but not domination.

The Communists suffered thumping defeats in recent days in union elections throughout the country. Where the Communists were certain their candidates would lose, they supported the 26th of July movement's candidates.

The Reds took a decisive beating in nationwide elections held in the Sugar Workers Federation, which has 500,000 members. The Communists won in only 8 of the 243 locals.

The Communists also lost in four other important union elections. These included the National Teachers College, the Modern Bus Union, and the Graphic Arts Union.

The Communist Party of Cuba has for many years maintained one of the most effective organizations in the Caribbean area. The party never broke openly with former dictator Fulgencio Batista but retained its members in certain key posts in the same manner the Reds have infiltrated in certain positions in the Castro government.

Members of the Communist Party, which is known as the Popular Socialist Party, still wear the uniform of the rebel army. Some of the Communists are officers, but with the exception of Maj. Ernesto Che Guevara, Argentine hero of the revolution, none is reported to be in a dominating position. Guevara is commander of La Cabana fortress.

The charges that Minister of Education Armando Hart and his wife, Haydee Santa Maria, are Communists is laughed at by Cubans, just as any attempt to label Castro as a Red is ridiculed.

Hart and his wife are devoted leftist revolutionaries like most of the 26th of July members. In Latin American politics there is a wide dividing line between leftist revolutionaries and Communists.

There is evidence that the newspaper Revolucion, organ of the 26th of July movement, is adopting a militant campaign against Communist infiltration in the labor movement. In recent years its editor, Carlos Franqui, has openly clashed with Communists.

The Government took over a network of radio stations early in January which was the property of Batista cronies and has been operating it under the Ministry of Property Recovery. The network is not run by a Communist, although Violetta Gasals, former television star, who is a fellow traveling sympathizer, works in a subordinate post.

Maj. Raul Castro, commander of the armed forces and brother of Fidel, makes no secret of the fact that he visited behind the Iron Curtain in 1953 at the age of 20. This, he argues, does not make him a Communist.

The press has been publishing all the news, including every accusation made of Communist infiltration in the Government, which has been transmitted by the wire service.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill designed to amend the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 so as to provide that in the absence of a designation of beneficiary thereunder by a person having national service life insurance or U.S. Government life insurance, the designated beneficiary of such insurance shall also be the designated beneficiary of any indemnity payable under such act. The bill provides that the third sentence of section 3 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 be amended to read that if the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured or if none has been designated, the Administrator shall make payment of the indemnity to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person, except that in any case where no beneficiary of the indemnity had been designated but the insured has in full force national service life insurance or U.S. Government life insurance the indemnity shall be paid in the amount authorized by the first sentence of section 5 to the designated beneficiary of such insurance if such designated beneficiary is within one of the classes herein provided. It is the purpose of this bill to minimize the confusion and to eliminate the uncertainty and to insure prompt payment by the Government to the close relatives of a serviceman who for some reason of misfortune or oversight no longer has a beneficiary under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 but who has such a beneficiary under either the national service life insurance or the U.S. Government life insurance. I believe that the passage of this bill will tend to help the family of the serviceman upon his death. I am hopeful that this bill will pass this Congress this year.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 2 hours, on June 26, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, May 14.

Mr. MCCORMACK, for 20 minutes, on Thursday.

Mr. PATMAN, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAILEY, for 45 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. LAFORE), for 15 minutes on Monday, May 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. LAFORE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. MEYER in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. FLYNN in two instances.

Mr. HALEY.

Mr. POWELL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1559. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, June 1859.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, May 14, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

967. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the period July 1, through December 31, 1958, listing new contracts negotiated under the authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on U.S. relations with South America (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7086. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 7087. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 7088. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7089. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7090. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7091. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7092. A bill to provide for the reorganization of administrative procedures and practices in Government operations for improving their economy and efficiency, to provide for the organization of machinery to coordinate and administer such procedures and related practices; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7093. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 7094. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7095. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 7096. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide relief with respect to the tax treatment of damages in antitrust actions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 7097. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 7098. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7099. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to provide a criminal penalty for violations of certain provisions of that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7100. A bill relating to mining claims on lands within the national forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7101. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7102. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, for the purpose of providing with respect to the requirements for the operation of subsidy constructed vessels that certain vessels shall be considered as operating in foreign trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 7103. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, to provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and to clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7104. A bill to amend section 1005(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the use of certified mail for service of process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7105. A bill to amend section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing by the Civil Aeronautics Board in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7106. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to forfeiture of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 7107. A bill to provide for the maintenance and operation of the flood control projects on the Snake River in the State of Wyoming by the Secretary of the Interior from the power revenue of the Palisades project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7108. A bill to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit stock of a small business corporation which is owned by a husband and wife to be treated as owned by a single shareholder for purposes of determining the number of shareholders of such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7109. A bill to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, to provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and to clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7111. A bill to amend section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing by the Civil Aeronautics Board in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7112. A bill to amend section 1005(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the use of certified mail for services of process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution designating mountain laurel as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature urging the Congress of the United States to reevaluate the age requirements for eligibility for old-age and survivors insurance in an effort to provide social security for unemployed older workers at an earlier age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 925, dealing with the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to resolution No. 27 passed at the 1959 session of the General Assembly of Maryland, and ratifying the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7113. A bill for the relief of Hilda Kruse Hacinkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7114. A bill for the relief of Erasmo Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 7115. A bill for the relief of Inga Maja Olsson Nylander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 7116. A bill for the relief of George W. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Credit Unions—Bulwark of Economic Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, credit unions are economic democracy in action, as I indicated in the following statement which I made this morning:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE KEN HECHLER, FOURTH WEST VIRGINIA DISTRICT, PRESENTED TO SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MAY 12, 1959, ON H.R. 5777 AND RELATED BILLS TO AMEND FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of over 36,000 credit union members in my home State of West Virginia, I wish to express my support of your bill, H.R. 5777.

I know your committee is aware of the great progress credit unions have made since the first one was established half a century ago in the United States. And I would like to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for your untiring work on behalf of credit unions in the quarter century since the passage of the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934.

As time and experience move along, the 1934 act needs strengthening. Exactly 9 years ago this month, I was with a great champion of credit unions, President Harry S. Truman, when he dedicated Filene House in Madison, Wis., to the memory of the Boston merchant and philanthropist who did so much for this movement. But since that day in 1950, as in other fields in the midfifties, we have not made the bold progress of former years.

I believe, as proposed in H.R. 5777, that Federal credit unions should be permitted to invest in the shares of central credit unions. I would also like to see the limits on certain types of loans raised, including the limit on unsecured loans, and I believe it would be wise to extend loan maturity from 3 to 5 years. The limit on unsecured loans should be increased from $400 to $1,000. After all, we know that since 1949 the purchasing power of the consumer dollar has decreased, and a $1,000 loan today would barely exceed the purchasing power of a $400 loan made in 1949.

It is for the welfare not only of individual credit union members, but for the entire economy of our country, that I support this legislation. In making these statutory changes, we are only taking note of the changes which have occurred in our economy—changes which, in most instances, have had their most telling effect upon the little man, the wage earner and the white-collar worker.

Mr. Chairman I believe deeply that the strength of our way of life lies in the fact that you and I and a majority of the Congress and the American people are convinced that freedom of economic opportunity is essential to our survival. Freedom of economic opportunity can only be achieved if we are concerned with the protection of that freedom for the little people—because we know that the big boys can take care of themselves.

Now credit unions are one of the best examples of economic democracy in action, for the benefit and protection of the little people, and we ought to do everything in our power to strengthen them. The people need a source, a safe source, from which to obtain small loans at low interest rates without turning to loan sharks.

In these days when we hear and read so much about Government expenditures and taxes, it is refreshing to recall that the Federal Credit Union system under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not cost the American taxpayer a red cent, and is self-sustaining. And we have an opportunity by passing H.R. 5777 to strengthen the whole system without spending any more money.

Several weeks ago, I had the honor to be invited to address the annual luncheon of the West Virginia Credit Union League, in my home town of Huntington, W. Va. I expected 30 or 40 hardy experts to be present, but I was amazed when 130 credit union officers from all over West Virginia turned up at the luncheon. Since they had been getting a steady diet of credit union facts for 24 hours I told them I'd talk with them about outer space and the work of my Committee on Science and Astronautics. I've never had such an attentive audience and while they listened to me talk about outer space they indicated by their questions that they had their feet on the ground. Finally, I did slip over a few remarks about credit unions, and I pledged my support for H.R. 5777.

This morning, Mr. Chairman I am here to redeem that pledge. For West Virginia, for the economy of the country and for the average man everywhere, I hope you will use your efforts to secure the enactment of this worthwhile legislation.

Military Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a copy of a letter which I have addressed to the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Raymond J. Saulnier, regarding the need for forceful actions toward unification of military supply activities. It has been my strong belief for many years that the enormity of the military supply activities has a tremendous effect on the entire economy. Furthermore, from my personal knowledge of the overlapping, duplication, and waste in and amongst the many military supply systems, there is an urgent need to bring about corrective measures at the earliest possible time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1959.

Hon. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SAULNIER: I am sure that you recall the recent discussion at the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee concerning the impact of military supply and service programs on the national economy.

It has been my strong belief for many years that the enormity of the military supply activities has a tremendous effect on the entire economy. Furthermore, from my personal knowledge of the overlapping, duplication, and waste in and amongst the many military supply systems, there is an urgent need to bring about corrective measures at the earliest possible date.

Enclosed is a report of the House Government Operations Committee which, at page 65 and following, details the extent of the military supply inventories. When one considers that the inventory of personal property is almost $120 billion and that in the supply systems alone there is $47 billion, it is no wonder that annual declarations of surpluses run at $8 to $10 billion and will continue to do so. I am sure that the attached monthly list of excess military property I am enclosing as a sample is convincing that factors other than obsolescence are responsible for generating much of the excess military property. If you will analyze the reported inventories of the individual departments and services I am sure that you will agree that much needs to be done to integrate common supply activities. But despite a long history of efforts to do just that, the military bureaucracies have always managed to remain intact.

The proponents of the National Security Act of 1947 intended that the Air Force would continue to obtain supply and service support from the Army. Despite this, the Air Force has worked diligently to become completely independent. In 1951–52, the Bonner committee, of which I was a member, held extensive hearings on military supply management and as a result of the hearings and reports, the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 Military Appropriations Act called for the establishment of an integrated military supply system. Some steps were taken by Secretary Lovett, particularly in setting up a coordinated medical supply activity known as the Alameda Medical Supply Test.

This test, though successful, was discontinued despite the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and others who had studied it. More recently, the Department of Defense has set up single manager systems for subsistence, clothing, medical supply, and petroleum products. This effort,

though apparently successful, is being stubbornly resisted by the military departments who fear loss of autonomy through any steps that tend toward unification.

The last Congress passed the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958 and included the so-called McCormack-Curtis amendment which gives the Secretary of Defense wide authority to operate supply and service activities through such an entity or entities as he deems appropriate to bring about economy and efficiency. Despite this broad authority there has been but small progress in accomplishing what to me is one of the most fruitful areas for economy. I know of no one who has objectively studied this matter who had a different opinion.

It seems to me that the time is long past when the common inventories and operations of the military services should be brought under unified control so that existing stores are taken in account before additional purchases are made. As a matter of fact, we have expended at least $150 million in developing a catalog system in order that this could be done.

I am sure you are aware that each military department spends hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the operation and maintenance of its own supply and depot system. Furthermore, the services compete against each other in many ways in the procurement of supplies, equipment, and personnel. Since most of the procurement is by negotiation the net effect of these methods is to accelerate an inflationary spiral in my opinion.

It seems to me that some forceful actions toward unification must be taken not only for the sake of defense itself but to relieve the economy of the inflationary pressures which are now being exerted upon it. Since the legislative framework appears to be adequate, I think that the executive branch is vulnerable in not vigorously pushing this matter. I cannot understand why the Budget Bureau condones this situation while it is simultaneously the management arm of the President, is responsible for reorganizational plans, and has the primary duty of screening the various appropriation estimates within the framework of a balanced budget. It is the belief of many people on the Hill that the Bureau has become a prisoner of the Pentagon and that the joint hearings on the military budget do not give the Bureau the control status it should have.

From what I can learn, the Budget Director is doing an excellent job and has the fortitude to do what is necessary. However, it is impossible for anyone to grasp the complexities of the Federal budget within a period of several years and he must rely upon his assistants. I think, however, that time is running swiftly and that some topside decisions must be taken in this area.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Stans and will appreciate any comments you or he may have with respect to this letter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

"Our American Heritage"—Mary Aline Magner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in this era of uneasiness in world and domestic problems, it is a refreshing privilege for me to call your attention to the efforts of Miss Mary Aline Magner, a resident of my congressional district, and to her fine music, copies of which she has recently provided each Member of Congress, along with a thoughtful and sincere letter.

We should be especially proud of the spirit, pride, and love for God and our country demonstrated in Miss Magner's words and music. Through these carefully written lyrics, we are reminded that our cherished freedom remains a priceless privilege—gained through struggle, prayer, and unity in our American heritage.

Congressman Gerald T. Flynn, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Defends the Richard I. Bong Airbase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with much dismay remarks made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to waste, frills, and extravagance in the construction of the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base at Kansasville in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin. These remarks were filed by a Congressman representing a district in which the base is not located, and were apparently made by him after examination of blueprints and plans furnished by the Leo A. Daley firm of architects of Omaha, Nebr. I also have a copy of these plans, and I have examined them thoroughly. It is with much displeasure that I take issue with remarks printed in the RECORD by a Member of Congress from Milwaukee. None of us favor spending for nonessentials. None of us favor military boondoggling. However, we are all in favor of building adequately and soundly for current needs with an eye open for future needs. The Bong Airbase anticipates a complement of military personnel and civilians working on the base, together with their families, of approximately 20,000 people. This base is being built in a country area and is approximately 20 miles from any metropolitan center.

The criticism contained in the RECORD was to the effect that money is being spent for a theater, bowling alley, hi-fi shop, gymnasium, and indoor swimming pool, steamroom, and squash court, and these facilities are not essential spending. I do not concur in this conclusion, and I allege that 20,000 people located in a country area some 20 miles from a metropolitan city must have on the base reasonable opportunities for relaxation and recreation. The building of a bowling alley or a gymnasium, including a swimming pool and massage room, is not a foolish expenditure of money. The Government of the United States has over $40,000 invested in the training of every one of these air cadets. Because of poor, uninteresting, and inadequate facilities, the Air Force has witnessed its fully trained and highly competent personnel, including those flying the planes, leave the service as soon as their tour of duty was completed. The Government then is compelled to spend another $40,000 to train a replacement. If the Government offered reasonable housing, as it is now doing under the Capehart housing program, and reasonable facilities for recreation, the percentage of those signing up for a second, third, and fourth enlistment would materially increase. The Air Force has experimented and has found a great increase in the reenlistment rate when living conditions have been improved, and this has accounted for a huge saving to the taxpayer. It, therefore, would be very foolish for the Air Force, in building this fine and modern new airbase, to fail to include therein a gymnasium. A bowling alley for the relaxation of the airmen and their families, and even a hi-fi shop in which junior can buy a record for his record player, and even a swimming pool for the airmen's use is not extravagance.

It is proposed in the bill of criticism that the airmen use gymnastic and swimming pool facilities located in cities 20 miles from the base. Imagine, an airman returning from a flight and getting into his car, or if he does not have his own car, of taking a bus into the nearest town some 20 miles away to find a gymnasium and swimming pool. From firsthand knowledge I can state, without fear of contradiction, that the swimming pools and gymnastic facilities in the cities of Racine and Kenosha, are inadequate for their own population, without taking into consideration the 20,000 people the base will bring in.

Most bases have a theater—and a theater providing a seating capacity for 650 people under modern conditions is not unrealistic or extravagant. It is merely building for present needs with an eye to the future, with a thought of taking care of normal needs of the 20,000 people who will live on or near the base. The criticism also includes a community service building wherein there are retail stores, snack bars, maintenance shops, warehouse, laundry and drycleaning shops, concessions, barbershops, a central post office, reading room, Red Cross office, and so forth. It is inconceivable to me that any Member of Congress would propose that a modern up-to-date Strategic Air Command base which will attract 20,000 people should be built in a country area 20 miles from any large city without such facilities being built into the base, and I do not feel it fair to criticize those who designed the base for this expenditure in money, any more than I would criticize the Air Force for building a modern SAC plane instead of duplicating the Kitty Hawk. We are living in the modern age of 1959, and looking forward to the sixties, and our bases must represent modern needs and facilities, and not the needs of World War I.

I have gone carefully over the plans and I believe that the SAC and the architectural firm should be highly complimented for the designing of a modern SAC base with modern facilities—and

on the other hand for the construction of a base that is not extravagant or wasteful, and that does not have needs above and beyond the requirements of the boys who are going to man and staff the base.

In answer to the question of whether the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base really needs these facilities, I say that the Bong Airbase and any other modern airbase built in a similar location definitely needs a swimming pool, a gymnasium, a bowling alley, and the other facilities described herein—and it would be preposterous and unthinkable to have military personnel who are on a 24-hour alert required to go to cities 20 miles away and attempt to use the inadequate facilities that those cities have. I feel it would be nearsighted and would do nothing to prevent the thousands of airmen, trained at great expense to the Government, from leaving the service. Whereas the facilities of a modern base will help to keep trained personnel in the service and will result in a large saving to the country. I earnestly solicit the examination of the Bong Airbase plans by any Member of Congress who has an interest therein.

Development of Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, from the vantage point of the professional forester, I wish to comment briefly on the report "Program for the National Forests" which the Agriculture Department sent to the Congress on March 24, 1959.

Because of the multiple use aspects of forest land which this report involves, it should be of interest to every Member and more particularly to my colleagues who have national forests in their States or districts.

With the rapid increase in our population and the increasing demand for natural resources to maintain an expanding economy, the use pressures on forest land are growing daily. Careful planning and full development of our forests are therefore necessary if both current and long-range resource needs are to be met.

Winter sports have become an intensive use on the Green Mountain National Forest in Vermont. We welcome this activity because it balances the recreational use in the forest and provides a year-long use by tourists. Because the areas are accessible to the heavily populated metropolitan areas in New England and the Northeast, their orderly expansion as provided for in this "Program for the National Forests" is essential. The local economy of the area is considerably benefited by the money which the skiers and recreationists spend on winter sports and other outdoor activities on the national forest.

This "Program for the National Forests" will improve hunting and fishing. Our lakes and streams on the Green Mountain National Forest provide sport fishing for thousands of visitors each summer. As more thousands come to Vermont and to the other national forests throughout America, full development of this wildlife resource of the forest is necessary and desirable.

To a forester, multiple use means the full use of all the renewable resources on forest land. The growing, cutting, and sale of timber is one of these uses. In Vermont, much high quality maple timber is harvested from the national forest.

This activity supports many small community forest industries. It provides the raw material for the manufacturer of maple bowls and other specialty products which require a high input of local labor. These wood products supplement the tourist trade and again the local economy of areas surrounding the national forest is improved. Also there are other special uses of national forest trees which provide the sap from which the famed Vermont maple syrup is made.

The nature of our country in Vermont and much of New England is such that watershed values are high. The land is glaciated and unstable. We have found that forest cover is one of the best stabilizing forces to keep the land from eroding into our streams and valleys. As a forester, I am pleased that this "Program for the National Forests" has plans for stepping up the management and protection of the watersheds on all the national forests throughout America.

This broad-scale program for the national forests includes accelerated research in forest genetics, timber cutting methods, new uses for low-quality trees and better protection from fire, insects, and disease.

Such research is essential if the forests' resources are to be kept renewable in quantities to meet the impact of present and future use.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that the Forestry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee plans to hold hearings on May 14 and 15 on this long-range conservation and development program for the national forests. I hope many of my colleagues will take advantage of this opportunity to indicate their interest in the full development of the national forests.

National Association of Plumbing Contractors Will Hold 77th Convention in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great trade associations in the construction industry, the National Association of Plumbing Contractors, will have its 77th annual convention and its 1959 National Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Exposition in Miami Beach, Fla., May 31–June 4, 1959.

There is an excellent reason why this splendid trade association is meeting for the first time in its long history in Florida, and that reason, Mr. Speaker, is because its president, John M. Rhoades, has been successful in his strenuous endeavors to bring this outstanding conclave to Florida.

The president, John M. Rhoades, of Sarasota, Fla., is one of our most respected citizens. He has built a fine business—a credit to himself and his profession. He is not only a successful businessman, but also a thoughtful, constructive, and progressive contractor.

Mr. Rhoades was born in Lakeland, Fla. He attended Georgia Tech and served region 4, Federal Public Housing Authority, as a mechanical engineer in Atlanta, Ga., during World War II. He is president of the John M. Rhoades Co., in Sarasota.

In association work, he served three terms as president of the Associated Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors of Florida, and is secretary-treasurer of his local association. He has been active in the National Association of Plumbing Contractors for the past 12 years, serving as chairman of the conference, sanitary, and sanitation committees, and as a member of the convention auditing, industry development, policy and interindustry liaison committees. He served on NAPC's board of directors in 1952–53 and was elected second vice president of NAPC in 1956.

He has been associated with the plumbing busines in Sarasota, Fla., for the past 34 years. A member of the Episcopal Church of the Redeemer in Sarasota, he is also a Kiwanian and an Elk. A 32d degree Mason, he is a member of the Egypt Temple Shrine in Tampa, and Samoor Grotto and Scottish Rite Club in Sarasota.

I wish to take this opportunity to join with my fellow Floridians in congratulating President John M. Rhoades and the National Association of Plumbing Contractors on 77 years of achievement and service to its membership and to the construction industry. My best wishes go to President Rhoades and the NAPC for a most successful convention and exposition in Miami Beach within the next few weeks.

The Cause of Human Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, May 6, I had the great privilege of attending a dinner given by the National Conference of Christians and Jews at New York's Waldorf-Astoria

Hotel, in honor of Mr. Louis Stein, president of Food Fair Stores, Inc. Mr. Stein was awarded the National Conference's Brotherhood Award for 1959, in recognition of his outstanding contribution in this most meaningful of all fields of endeavor.

The occasion was a most fitting one for the delivery by the guest speaker, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, of one of the finest and most moving addresses on the unbounded capabilities of the human spirit and man's infinite potential for moral brilliance and grandeur that I have ever heard.

I was so stirred by the spirit and breadth of the Secretary's excellent remarks, entitled "The Cause of Human Dignity," that I felt they should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The Secretary devoted his text to reaffirming with brilliance and clarity that if mankind is to preserve and advance the great ideals of human freedom and dignity, he must realize that their effective consummation is inextricably interlocked with the duty to strive toward their effectuation. Stressing the moral and economic reasons for the elimination of barriers of prejudice and bigotry, he emphasized that both deep moral values and enlightened national self-interest demand the eradication of discrimination. This challenge, he explained, "is the most important decision facing America today."

Secretary Mitchell's moving thesis reflects so fully the great aims of the conference and is so appropriate to the needs of the times that I deem it an honor to request that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as follows:

THE CAUSE OF HUMAN DIGNITY

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell before the National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y., May 6, 1959)

I am happy to be here this evening, to add my voice to the others who have taken this time to honor Mr. Stein.

As you know, Sir Winston Churchill is visiting in Washington at this very moment. It was 18 years ago this coming June that Sir Winston was in the United States on a previous visit; as some of you may remember, he spoke at the University of Rochester, here in New York State. In that speech he presented an idea that has remained with me, and one, I believe, that we here this evening can review with good advantage.

"The destiny of mankind," Churchill said, "is not decided by material computation. When great causes are on the move in the world * * * we learn that we are spirits, not animals; and that something is going on in space and time, and beyond space and time, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

For us, of course, the greatest cause is that of human freedom, as it expresses itself in the cause of political freedom, the cause of individual liberty, the cause of human dignity, the cause of freedom from want, and freedom from ignorance, and freedom to worship as one will.

Mr. Churchill, with his customary wisdom, did not relate these things to mere material computation. He did not add up imports and exports, investments and labor forces, industrial plants and agricultural potentials, and give the total of these as freedom.

He related the great causes, rather, with "something going on in space and time, and beyond space and time." He was certain that any computation would fall into a great error which did not account for the accountable, the unpredictable: the creative power of the free spirit.

He perceived that man's greatest causes, today as 18 years ago, arise from the acknowledgement of that spirit.

Some people saw, 18 years ago, that this was the fundamental distinction between the free societies of the Western World, and the tyranny of the Communist world.

So coarse and shallow is the Communist view of man and his destiny that a few weeks ago a Soviet theorist announced that the satellites and rockets of recent years have adequately disproven the idea of God since they reached into heaven and didn't find Him.

I sometimes think that this kind of moral moronity is a greater danger to peace than armed aggression.

You will note, also, that Mr. Churchill's idea of a transcendental destiny is interlocked with the idea of duty.

Having realized what he is, man is obligated to act upon that knowledge.

Certainly our philosophy of life is much more than a structure of thought and logic; it is a pattern for action and plan for activity.

Thus, we in the Western World are presented with this decision—what actions are we to to take in response to our public belief in man's dignity?

Let's start right here at home.

I need not tell a gathering like this how short we are of acting as if we believed in the dignity of all men—both in what we do and what we say within our own border.

We pride ourselves on being a state created to protect human dignity. And we have a long tradition of opportunity here, based upon our early history when every newcomer to these shores found an open road and a wide land.

Now, however, the test of freedom is no longer only whether or not we can provide opportunity to newcomers—but to our own people who are within our borders but outside our society, closed off from the full experience of American life by barriers of racial and economic discrimination.

To meet this test, we can no longer rely on wide ranges of open land and new roads through a wilderness.

The old national road to the west, the old Homestead Act, find their equivalents in equal job opportunity in all our plants and offices and mills and mines and ships. The road to new opportunity is no longer a geographic line on a map; it runs through the plant gate to the hiring office, and it may end in the President's office.

But we all know it has barriers, detours, do-not-enter signs for many thousands of American citizens who hope to travel down it. It was not long ago that Jews and Irish immigrants faced these signs. Today the Negro in the South, and in some northern communities; the Puerto Rican on the east coast; the American oriental on the west coast; the American Indian—these stand by the wayside, watching the parade of American progress go by. Their presence is enough to make us suspect that what we say about America and what we do about it are sometimes two different things.

Yet this discrimination is intolerable, not only from moral but for economic reasons as well, reasons that can be proven down to the last decimal point.

Economically, we cannot support our standard of living for an exploding population, and maintain an adequate defense, without making use of all our human resources. We need all the talent, all the skill we can muster, and we need to develop it now.

Let me give you the figures:

There are 100 million more people in this country than there were in 1900. More than 50 million children have been born since World War II. By 1970, there will be 210 million Americans.

Now, note this fact:

In 1970, there will be 20 million people in this country over 65 years of age. That is a tremendous number of people not in the most productive age group. At the same time, because our birth rate was very low during the depression years of the 1930's, there will actually be nearly 2 million fewer 20- to 29-year-olds in our male population in the 1960's than there are now.

Consider what that means in terms of need for skilled manpower, for reviewing our personnel policies in regard to older men and women.

But that isn't all the story. Within those statistics there are important currents and changes which put an even heavier strain on our supply of trained, educated manpower:

The composition of the workforce is changing. We are needing fewer unskilled laborers; in fact, we will need no more to do all the essential jobs in the 60's than we have today. But we'll need 50 percent more professional and technical workers, 30 percent more craftsmen, and 30 percent more semiskilled workers.

Those are the figures. To sustain our present standard of living, to say nothing of mobilizing better the human resources we have in a highly competitive world, we must start now to train and educate all our young people, whatever the color, wherever their parents were born, wherever they may worship, because we cannot be without them.

The low birthrate of the 1930's has produced a generation which will be able to produce enough goods and services for a much larger population only if it is fully used, only if we waste none of our human resources. That is a practical argument which should satisfy even those who have no patience with history—or with humanity—or with religion.

But, although this practical argument is a compelling and convincing one, our stake in broader opportunity is much larger and much more essential to America on another level, and one that is difficult to document.

In the world today there are 20 new nations under the sun. They are something new to history—and they are going through a measuring-up and sizing process, making a careful estimate of the value of friendship, especially when it comes to the two most influential members of the community of nations: Russia and ourselves.

How do we look to them?

Do we look like a society topheavy with the chosen and preferred? Do we look like a society that makes varvelous progress at the expense of the least of us? Is it as Ghandi said to an American visitor inquiring about peace: "Go back to America," Ghandi said, "and when you have learned to treat your Negro citizens as equals, then come talk to me of peace. Until then, I will not listen to you."

In a world in which the educated, opulent white man is in the small minority, just how far do we expect a society to be honored that honors him to the exclusion of others?

It is against that background of world awakening and of domestic economic need that the true stature of the opportunity problem in our Nation must be measured.

The chance to live a decent comfortable life, to enjoy the products of industry and agriculture, to have the protections of medicine and savings, to have open access to the benefits of education and employment, and to worship in the manner that the conscience dictates—that is what the struggle for the world is all about. This is what it boils

down to, as an aspiration only for many, many millions, and as a reality for a few lucky ones. How we conduct ourselves in the pursuit of these goals, whether selfishly or selflessly, is the most important decision facing America today.

One might think that there are few occasions for a practical pursuit of our duty; as a matter of fact, almost every day is an occasion.

A great number of writers have, for a long number of years now, tried to write about what they call "the American experience"—trying to define it, to analyze it, to picture it. I think, in the end, it is this—a feeling of respect for each and every fellow human being, knowing in our hearts that there really is something going on in space and time which has to do with the human spirit, and knowing in our hearts that we have a duty because if it.

Thank you.

Congratulations to the New Government of Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to greet the Kingdom of Laos, Prince Souphanouvong and His Excellency, Ourot R. Sovannavong, Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I take this opportunity, also, to congratulate the new Laos Government, presided over by His Excellency, Phoui Sananikone. This Government, whose policy is one of restriction, austerity, and order, has set itself a hard and definite objective which can be summed up as follows:

First. Fight against Communist infiltration and development in the kingdom.

Second. General reorganization of the political, economic, financial, and social fields.

Third. National recovery.

The task of stabilizing nations newly emerged from colonialism is an immense one which we of America too often fail to appreciate. For, as His Excellency Sananikone states it:

> Yesterday, we had to work out the reunification of our motherland and the reconciliation of all the Lao peoples. Today, our goal is to safeguard our independence and our newly achieved unity by protecting them against the most terrible evil that threatens them; communism.

His Excellency, Phoui Sananikone, emphasized that the government program rested on the following basic principles:

First. The fight against extremist ideology.

Second. True unity and independence of the Kingdom.

Third. The well-being of the Lao people and respect for the regime while seeking to promote education and medico-social welfare even to the most desolate regions; and to contribute to the maintenance of peace through a strict policy of neutrality within the framework of the principles of Panchasila and of the Charter of the United Nations.

In addition to the above enunciated policy of Laos, His Excellency pointed out that in the area of economic and financial policy the country's objective is the economic development and full exploitation of the country's national resources. In this latter regard, he pointed out that his government supported an all-out drive in favor of both foreign and local investments.

His Excellency deserves the commendation of leaders of this country for his announced policy and for the resistance he has maintained against Communist infiltration. It was his forthright leadership that saved that nation from being overrun by the Communists last year. But for the $48 million in United States aid which tiny Laos received in 1957, the Communists might have rolled up an added victory in Asia and have now been in possession of another beachhead there.

Though determined to define itself, Laos wishes to remind its friends everywhere that it is traditionally a peace-loving country with only one wish to rebuild its economy severely damaged by war and lift the level of its people on all fronts. Again, I wish to salute the tiny country for its determination to be both free and peaceful.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 9, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5TH DISTRICT TEXAS)
MAY 9, 1959.

The Trinity River survey appropriation was the subject of the Appropriation Committee's hearing at which a large Dallas group appeared. Congressmen of the Trinity River area joined the delegation of Texans in a united front requesting the survey by the Corps of Engineers. I was happy to join in support of this interstate matter. It is both legitimately a Federal-State proposition and within justifiable cost limits of flood control and navigation projects by the usual tests of priority. The big "if" is whether boondoggle and wasteful projects will also receive attention now, thus squeezing out legitimate projects in the exceeding of the budget.

President Eisenhower warmly greeted Bill Junker of Dallas, the Goodwill Industry's Man of the Year, along with Bill's mother and Goodwill officials. The President's attention was a further honor to Bill who was elected by his 35,000 nationwide handicapped fellow workers. Along with personally commending Bill Junker, the President described animatedly the paintings and art objects in his beautiful oval office. He is looking very fit. I had the opportunity to commend the President for his efforts to maintain a balanced budget. When I exhorted him to stand firm, he laughed and said it wouldn't be he who weakened. It was up to Congress.

H.R. 3460, a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (TVA), to permit self-financing by the TVA issuing its own bonds up to $750 million, was the subject of long, controversial, but generally good-natured debate. The TVA is wholly owned and operated by the Federal Government. Electricity developed serves 5 million people in 1,250,000 families in 80,000 square miles in parts of 7 States—Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi,, Tennessee, and Kentucky. Originally, the TVA was intended for navigation and flood control. A small amount of hydroelectric power development was included. Since then the electricity production has mushroomed to include many steam-generated powerplants. Power output and area served has grown terrifically. This bill would permit the TVA's three-man Board of Directors to issue bonds for new powerplant and facilities construction on terms and conditions of their choosing.

Arguments for include: (1) Twelve percent yearly growth requires $180 million yearly in plant expansion; (2) 50 percent of power produced is used by Government installations; (3) besides paying 3 percent interest yearly ($36 million) on TVA Federal indebtedness of $1,200 million, this amount will be reduced from TVA revenues by $10 million per year; (4) Congress has 90 days to veto new TVA construction. Arguments against include: (1) Though wholly federally owned, the Federal Government would have no control—neither the Treasury Department over the bonds, the Budget Bureau over expenditures, since this would be outside the budget, nor Congress, since usual appropriations procedures would be sidestepped; (2) the opposition of the Treasury, Budget Bureau, and Comptroller General were not printed in the hearings or report, so Congressmen were denied this usual information; (3) TVA bonds would compete with U.S. bonds without Treasury control; (4) bonds, though alleged to be secured solely by TVA revenues, would in fact be U.S. obligations since TVA is federally owned.

For myself, the more fundamental objection was not stressed, as almost everyone accepts this 27-year-old experiment in socializing power production, and that is that Government should not be in business operation in competition with its citizens in their private enterprise. Further, subsidy for a few at the expense of all is not a Federal right, even though the Federal Government has done so. These basic objections should be met head on and solved. My suggestion? That the TVA be sold by the Federal Government to the people of the area served by the TVA, a simple and sensible solution to disposing of public power facilities here and elsewhere. Amendments sponsored by Republicans to improve the bill by reestablishing congressional control over this financing were defeated by the Democrats in almost a solid partyline vote. Obviously, this will be a political campaign issue by both parties with some exceptions, namely, the switching of Republicans in the TVA area and a few Democrats outside TVA. The closeness of amendment votes indicated that a Presidential veto cannot be overridden by the House. Interesting, indeed, was the "Buy American" amendment sponsored by a Democrat labor leader in which the Republicans with only a handful of Democrats supported U.S. industry. This amendment would have forbidden TVA to buy foreign equipment with its lower cost because of lower wage rates.

The $64 question now is: Will the House Democrat leadership bypass the Rules Committee to force out the huge, costly housing bill? At present, a rules deadlock has it bottled up. Will the spending deluge of this and other pet programs yet engulf us? Right now, it's a stalemate. The people hold the key to the balanced budget and deficit financing. They should write their Representatives and Senators.

Federal Administrative Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today a bill I was privileged to cosponsor during the last Congress, entitled the "Federal Administrative Practice Act."

This is a major and comprehensive piece of legislation which would implement proposals advanced by the American Bar Association after intensive study and independent evaluation of current administrative procedures and practices.

Mainly, the bill does four things. It would establish at interagency level the Office of Federal Administrative Practice which would be the vehicle through which badly needed coordination and direction of procedures and practice on matters of concern to all governmental agencies would be accomplished. The bill would provide new and improved procedures for the selection, appointment, and administration of hearing commissioners. The bill seeks to increase the efficiency of the Government legal services by establishing for the first time a legal career service for civilian lawyers in government which would serve not only to attract the more capable and talented lawyers to Federal service but would provide incentive and encouragement so desperately needed to keep them in Government service. The final major purpose of this bill is to assure all persons the right of representation before Government departments and agencies by both attorneys and qualified lay persons, the bill would assist attorneys around the country by providing for centralized admission to practice; at the same time, it imposes standards of conduct upon these representatives, and contains a provision for adequate disciplinary proceedings.

During the last Congress, reports were requested from 26 Government departments and agencies. The reports have been received, most of them in support of the general objectives of the bill, some in support or in opposition to some parts of the bill, and most of them suggesting amendments to the legislation.

I respectfully submit that with the ever-increasing amount of administrative practice within Government circles, there is a great need for a thorough congressional study of this field to bring up to date and to improve the legal procedures and services of all of our Federal departments and agencies, some 70 in number. My bill seeks to simplify and modernize these procedures, to make them more uniform wherever that can be done, to encourage able lawyers to enter Federal service as a career, and to assure our citizens that they will receive fair and impartial consideration at hearings conducted before truly independent hearing commissioners.

Each of us in government and all of our citizens have an interest in this proposal. I hope the Committee will see fit to schedule consideration of this legislation in its agenda this year, so that full testimony and study can be given this subject and all suggested amendments carefully reviewed, to the end that our vast governmental operations in this field are improved and modernized in the best interest of our citizens and the legal officers of our Federal Government.

Justin Smith Morrill Homestead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of the Justin Smith Morrill Homestead at Strafford, Vt., as a national monument. This bill, H.R. 5934, now with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is most appropriate for Congress to consider at this time, because we are approaching the centennial celebration of the great Land-Grant College Act of 1862, better known as the Morrill Act for its sole author, Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont. It would be fitting indeed to make provision in ample time for the dedication of this shrine to the memory of Senator Morrill during the year of events which is being planned for 1962 to mark the 100th anniversary of the establishment of our national system of land-grant colleges and State universities.

In connection with this proposal, I would remind the Members of the House that we have already acted favorably on April 20 on a bill, H.R. 4012, to provide for a Centennial Celebration Commission and for other appropriate recognition of the Morrill Act in 1962. This bill, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Congressman CELLER, takes note of both the establishment of land grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, both of which occurred in 1862. These historic acts have had an invaluable, almost incalculable, bearing on the development of agriculture and higher education in the United States.

It is fitting indeed for Congress to establish such a commission as provided in H.R. 4210 in order that appropriate events can be arranged and supported during 1962.

One such appropriate event of this centennial celebration would be the dedication as a national monument of the home of the author, in fact the sole author, of the act which we will be commemorating, the Morrill Act. Senator Justin Smith Morrill was born in Strafford in 1810, the son of a blacksmith, and he received his own formal education in the little red schoolhouse of the day. He had to leave school at the age of 14 to go to work, but he never forgot the importance of books and education. Morrill was successful in business, and when he felt that he had acquired enough to live on, he turned to public affairs and served Vermont in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate for 44 years. Having been denied higher educational opportunities himself, Justin Smith Morrill was resolutely determined that others would have this great opportunity, and he initiated and provided the leadership for passage of one of the most memorable educational measures yet known, the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges Act. It was the high point of a distinguished career.

We all know the enormous importance of the land-grant colleges and State universities. There are now 68 of them in our country, at least one in every State, including Alaska and Hawaii, as well as one in Puerto Rico. It is estimated that about 20 percent of the Nation's college students are enrolled in land grant institutions. More than 40 percent of the doctorate degrees in all subjects, more than half in the sciences and in the health professions, and all those in agriculture, are conferred by land-grant colleges and universities. Furthermore, the quality has been extraordinary. Of 35 living American Nobel Prize winners who went to college in this country, 21 have earned degrees from land-grant institutions. This is truly evidence of the national character of the Morrill Act and of the interest that there is in honoring its author, Justin Smith Morrill.

Morrill distinguished himself as a legislator, and was referred to at the time as the "Gladstone of America." It is said that in the field of finance lay his greatest talents, and he gave years of leadership to the Ways and Means and Finance Committees in Congress. Also, he served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Buildings and Grounds and is largely responsible for the planning and execution of the terraces, fountains, and gardens around the Capitol, as well as the completion of the Washington Monument. However, it is interesting that this Vermont Senator, deprived of higher learning himself, should be remembered best for the Land-Grant College Act, and for his important part in the establishment of the Library of Congress as a truly national institution during the 19th century. This merely serves to confirm the broad character and vision of Morrill, a man to whom higher education and the Nation owes so much.

Strafford always remained home for the Senator, and his homestead there is an attractive, charming place, definitely and closely related to the Senator's work and achievements. Acquisition would be by gift from the Strafford Historical Society, Inc., and would be made possible by the generous support which is already indicated by friends of the society and admirers of Morrill. The house is reasonably well preserved, and is a delightful example of Victorian gothic. It is set near the Common in one of our beautiful Vermont villages, the village where Morrill was born and went to school, where he operated a general store, and where he returned regularly all during his 44 years in Congress. This village will be within about 15 miles of a main

intersection in the projected new Interstate Highway System, making it easily accessible to travelers from both Boston to the east and from Connecticut and New York to the south. Yet it will at the same time be far enough from these main routes so as to be assured of the quiet and deep charm which our Vermont villages exemplify.

There is wide interest in this project among educators all over the country. Everyone familiar with land-grant colleges will agree that it would be fitting to honor the man whose vision is responsible for their establishment. The centennial office of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities has already indicated its interest for this proposal in conjunction with its plans for the centennial celebration in 1962. We will want to take action early enough so that dedication can be arranged in conjunction with the centennial activities planned for 1962. That is the obvious and appropriate year for such a dedication, and it would be a high point of the celebration. The impact of Senator Morrill's efforts are national and even worldwide in scope, and in many ways they are more memorable and more important for their positive results than are many of the other events which we already commemorate. The name of Justin Smith Morrill means a great deal to our country as a whole and is particularly honored in the field of higher education.

In Vermont our State legislature is taking steps already to do its part in observing the centennial celebration, as urged in section 7 of the proposed H.R. 4210. I am sending a copy of the recent resolution to this effect by our general assembly to Chairman CELLER, and I would also like to insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point:

JOINT RESOLUTION 23

Resolution relating to the observance of the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862

Whereas the Morrill Land-Grant College Act was enacted into the laws of this Nation in 1862; and

Whereas the author of this act was Justin Smith Morrill, of Strafford, Vt., a Member of the U.S. Congress from Vermont for the period 1855 until 1898; and

Whereas the act which carries the name of this famous Vermonter has resulted in the founding of 68 land-grant colleges and universities, of which the University of Vermont is one; and

Whereas those 68 colleges and universities have given instruction and training to hundreds of thousands of young men and young women of our Nation, many of whom could not otherwise have afforded a college education; and

Whereas the year 1962 will be the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act; and

Whereas the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities are planning a nationwide observance during 1962 for the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Governor of the State of Vermont appoint a committee of five members to serve without compensation. This committee's duties will be to plan a suitable statewide observance during 1962 for the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act and to honor the famous Vermonter, Justin Smith Morrill, who designed the Morrill Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to bring to the attention of the House two further resolutions in support of the Morrill homestead bill, H.R. 5934. These resolutions show the strong local support which such a project will have, as well as showing the interest which Vermont has in obtaining its first national monument, and in fact its first recognition of any sort by the National Park Service. At present our State has no national monument, and no more appropriate one can be suggested than the homestead of Justin Smith Morrill, a great Vermonter and a great American statesman, whose vision and determination served the cause of education, and thus the Nation, so well. It would be a monument of truly national interest and character. The resolution of the Vermont General Assembly, passed on April 14, the anniversary date of Morrill's birth in 1810, and the resolution of the Strafford Historical Society, Inc., which has been most active in support of this proposal, are as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 27

Joint resolution relating to the Justin Smith Morrill Memorial and urging the passage of H.R. 5934 by the Congress of the United States

Whereas Justin Smith Morrill of Strafford, Vt., was a Member of the U.S. Congress for nearly 50 years; and

Whereas he served his State and country with honor and distinction; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a measure, H.R. 5934, providing for the purchase and restoration of the Justin Smith Morrill homestead in the town of Strafford for the purpose of its preservation as an historical monument to his memory and achievements; and

Whereas on April 14, 1810, 149 years ago today, Justin Smith Morrill was born in the town of Strafford; and

Whereas this general assembly is cognizant of the great honors that have been brought to the State of Vermont by his many achievements, particularly as to his authorship of the famous Land Grant Acts to colleges in the field of education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby goes on record as favoring the passage of H.R. 5934 by the Congress of the United States, and urge early and favorable action by the Department of the Interior in this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vermont congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the president of the University of Vermont, the president of the University of New Hampshire, the president of the University of Massachusetts, the director of the Vermont Historical Society, the chairman of the Vermont Historic Sites Commission, and the president of the Strafford Historical Society.

RESOLUTION OF THE STRAFFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY, INC., STRAFFORD, VT.

Whereas Justin Smith Morrill contributed much for the good of the country during his long service as a Member of Congress; and

Whereas his most memorable achievement was his authorship and adoption by Congress of the Land-Grant College Act signed into law by Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862; and

Whereas the impact of this legislation has been and will continue to be of enormous value to our Nation's progress; and

Whereas in recognition of the Nation's debt of respect, a bill has been introduced into Congress by Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, providing for the acquirement and administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the Morrill homestead in Strafford, Vt., as a national monument: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors and members of the Strafford Historical Society urge the passage of the bill; and be it further

Resolved, That favorable consideration be given to dedicating the monument on July 2, 1962, the centennial of the Land-Grant College Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman MEYER and to any others whom our members may select.

Controlling Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House of Representatives today a bill which is to be known as the Anti-Inflation Act of 1959. The bill would authorize the President to freeze our entire economy for a period not in excess of 90 days, during which period the Congress of the United States would have time to adequately consider the advisability of continuing the freeze, and the best manner in which to effectuate controls, if found necessary.

We all recognize that resort to direct controls is dangerous to economic freedom and incompatible with our free enterprise system. Nevertheless, in an emergency, I feel that the President should have authority, at least for a limited period, to protect consumers, workers, farmers, persons living on fixed or limited incomes, and business against the menace and danger of runaway inflation. The position of world leadership of the United States rests primarily upon the strength of our economic system, and must not, under any circumstances, be jeopardized by sudden inflation.

Our dollars purchase less and less every day, and it is about time that the machinery to cope with this problem be made available if and when needed.

When I first came to Congress over 6 years ago, in 1953, the purchasing power of the dollar, using 1947 to 1949 as a base period, was 87.4 cents. As of March of this year that purchasing power had been reduced to 80.4 cents, a decline of almost 7 cents in a 6-year period. Using 1939 as a base period we find that the dollar is worth only 48 cents at the present time, so we can clearly see that in a 20-year period we have lost over 50 percent of the value of the dollar.

History has demonstrated that the greatest danger from inflation comes when an emergency suddenly develops.

It is national policy that the President have the authority, at the moment of crisis, to take the necessary steps to protect the economic stability and security of the Nation. I believe my bill will provide such protection.

Safety Patrol Delegation for 1959 From the First Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to advise this honorable body of a civic project in my hometown of Racine, Wis., in which a large number of manufacturers, individuals, and private organizations have cooperated. This civic and community project has made it possible for the city of Racine to participate annually in the grade school safety patrol program. Racine, Wis., was one of the pioneers in this movement; the first unit of the school safety patrol program in Wisconsin was organized in the city of Racine on January 11, 1926. It was one of the first such units organized in the Nation. Racine realized then and knows now the value of such a program in protecting the lives of schoolchildren at school crossings adjacent to elementary schools. In the 33 years since Racine has been extremely fortunate in that there has never been an accident involving a schoolchild at a school crossing where these safety patrol youngsters have been on duty.

A distinguished Racine citizen, Dr. George Walter, now deceased, gave of his time for many years in the promotion and development of this project. In his memory the group of industrialists, individuals and private organizations above mentioned have created a memorial fund, a nonprofit organization dedicated totally to providing finances through voluntary donation of funds, which are used to defray the annual expenses of sending one safety patrol boy or girl from each school in the city of Racine to Washington to participate in the annual safety patrol parade. These schoolchildren are accompanied by several civic-minded citizens and officials. The result of this trip spurs the young boys and girls on to dedicated service to the safety patrol. The result is that Racine is developing character in its young people, safety at its school crossings and has a program of which all can be proud.

It was with pride that I witnessed these boys and girls march in Saturday's parade. It was a happy occasion for me to visit and have breakfast with them while they were in Washington. The boys and girls selected this year and the school from which they came are:

School, Racine, Wis.: James Blake, St. John's Lutheran; Gary Bosak, Garfield School; Dale Dow, Winkler; James Esser, Holy Trinity School; Donald Fowler, St. Rose; Stephen Heisa, Stephen Bull; Marvin Johnson, St. Charles', Burlington, Wis.; Dale Ketterhagen, St. Mary's, Burlington, Wis.; Sigmund Kizirnis, St. Joseph's; Robert Knotek, St. John's Nepomuk; Lawrence Kraus, Lincoln Elementary; Craig Monroe, Our Father's Lutheran; John Morgan, Jerstad-Agerholm; Daniel Panyk, Rapids; Jerry Pusch, Trinity Lutheran; Ronald Rasmussen, Howell; Charles Retert, Roosevelt; Robert Richards, Jr., Wadewitz; John Schatzman, Franklin; David Wenszell, St. Mary's; James Stratman, St. Edwards'; Charles Wittkowski, Holy Name School; John Zimmerman, Epiphany Lutheran; Daniel Zuehlke, Washington; Theodore Zukewich, Sacred Heart; Kenneth Burns, Elkhorn School, Elkhorn, Wis.; Dick Pollak, Elkhorn School, Elkhorn, Wis.; Jack Zwieg, Elkhorn School, Elkhorn, Wis.; Lois Dandeneau, St. Patrick's School; Wendy Jane Dibble, S. C. Johnson; Jane Gutknecht, Franksville; Charlene Mae Harlow, St. Stanislaus; Ellen Ihrman, Winslow; Annette Jardina, St. Rita; Jane Mutschmann, James; Susan Oravetz, Fratt Elementary; Joyce Petersen, Gilbert Knapp; Marilyn Schetter, McKinley Elementary; Sally Shookman, Beebe; Mary Teut, St. John's Evangelical Lutheran, Burlington, Wis.; Pauline Walsh, Waller School, Burlington, Wis.; Sandra Weiss, Mitchell Elementary; Nancy Wtipil, Jefferson; Kathie Zabit, Trautwein.

The chaperones caring for these boys and girls were: Harold A. Schink, Racine County Safety Council; Officer Edward Kirt, Racine Police Department; Sgt. James Anderson, Racine Sheriff's Department; Mrs. Bertha Halliday, R.M. Racine Health Department; Miss Grace Piskula, physical education consultant, Racine Public Schools.

I commend both the children and their chaperones for the fine display they put on in Washington and for a job well done. I commend their schools for adequately preparing them for the trip. The chaperones said they were the finest behaved group of children that they had yet taken to Washington and I commend the civic-mindedness of the group and the individuals contributing to the Dr. Walter memorial fund for this most worthy project.

Mockery of Civil Service Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Monday, May 11, which was holding hearings on the so-called loyalty-security bill. This followed the testimony of Mr. Loyd Wright, of Los Angeles, Chairman of the President's Commission on Security and former president of the American Bar Association:

Thursday, Mr. Wright, you used most of your time to make an eloquent statement about the danger of communism. You spent practically no time on the merits of the bill before us. Of course we Members of Congress, like other Americans, don't want Communists and other subversives in Government employ. I think you could have assumed that attitude on our part.

What you, as well as the witnesses who preceded you, did not demonstrate was the need for this legislation. Of course, it is not the bill you had in mind when you came before us 2 years ago. This bill was an emergency measure to tide us over until your more comprehensive bill was introduced. I wonder what happened to your bill. I know what happened to the Walter bill. It passed the House but died in the Senate. I have heard of no dire consequences. Perhaps you have.

Let's discuss need. We don't need this legislation to keep Communists out of Government service. We already have laws on the books to do that. I refer you to the Hatch Act and the Internal Security Act of 1950.

We don't need it to keep subversives out because we have laws against espionage and sabotage.

I can't see then that we need to correct the Cole decision. If you add almost 2 million employees on the theory that each must be investigated and watched, you not only put an impossible burden on our FBI, but you are making a ridiculous and slanderous attack on good Americans.

You are also opening the way to abuses which would very soon make a mockery of the tenure assurances in the civil service system. Let's look at the bill and consider how it would work.

I am an agency chief. You are an employee with tenure under civil service. If I want you fired, for any reason, good or bad, founded in fact or not, I can do it. I don't have to have any particular grounds for calling you a security risk. I, your accuser, set up your so-called hearing and so-called appeal. You can't call witnesses, much less identify, or face, or cross-examine the witnesses against you.

As for the appeal to the Civil Service Commission, you are a lawyer, Mr. Wright. Members of the Commission are not. Furthermore, the only record they have is one prepared by the agency head, who is at the same time the accuser, judge, and jury.

This shocks me. I hope it shocks you. It shocks the League of Women Voters and many other Americans. We think that designating a person as a security or loyalty risk is a very serious matter. We think it should be done by due process of law. You know what that means. You know that the procedures set up in this bill are a travesty of due process.

We do have due process of law in our courts. I say let the courts dispose of persons, Government employees or not, who conspire or act against our Nation.

The Civil Service Commission 2 years ago took no position on this bill. I hope it will speak up strongly against it.

The Association of the Bar of the city of New York opposes this kind of legislation.

You were concerned about fairness and uniformity when you testified 2 years ago and recommended a Central Review Board (p. 47, 1957 hearings). Yet you are here endorsing this legislation which has no such Board.

[From Labor, Washington, D.C., May 9, 1959]

MUST WE SACRIFICE LIBERTY FOR SECURITY

"The scars of McCarthyism are still with us," said the conservative Denver Post re-

cently in a significant editorial that deserves wider circulation.

"Today most of us consider that we have recovered fairly well from that period of pointless suspicion, fear, character assassination, and ruined careers," the Post continues. "Therefore, it is interesting to ask how many of the following practices are still going on:

"Punishment for the advocacy of ideas, unconnected with any immediate action.

"Loyalty checks in which unverified accusations are used against persons who then have no opportunity to confront their accusers.

"Investigations of universities, foundations, and churches, by congressional committees, even though there is no direct connection to proposed legislation."

All those practices are still going on, the editorial says. "The truth of the matter is that the assault on civil liberties began before McCarthy ever made any headlines, and still persists today."

The editorial then adds:

"An even more widespread evil than the malpractices listed above is the general disrepute into which controversy of any kind has fallen. Deep probing of the institutions and customs by which we live is considered at best impolite and at worst the sign of someone who is 'politically unreliable.'

"At the root of this attitude is the idea that, in the face of Communist aggression, liberty must be sacrificed for the sake of security." That idea, the editorial says, "is the most mischievous political patent medicine ever swallowed by the American people."

Labor which opposed McCarthyism when that destructive doctrine was at its height, feels like the Denver Post that the battle to preserve the liberities guaranteed by the Constitution is not yet won. The American people must be constantly on guard to protect both liberty and security.

How Can World Law Be Achieved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from Donald Harrington, president of the United World Federalists, enclosing a copy of the speech Vice President NIXON delivered on April 13, 1959, before the Academy of Political Science on the subject of how world law might be achieved.

Mr. Harrington believes that this subject merits immediate public discussion and debate. I agree with him. Certainly Vice President NIXON's speech and the comments of the highly respected Columnist James Reston deserve to be read and considered by as many people as possible. Therefore, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I want to commend the United World Federalists, Inc., for calling this important matter to the attention of all the Members of the Congress. I have always had a high regard for this organization because, unlike so many organizations we have today with ideas and a mission, they have remained open-minded on the subject. They have not resorted to attacking the motives of those who disagree with them. Indeed, their primary objective seems to have been to keep the subject of world law and how we achieve it open for discussion.

I agree with their basic premise: the question is no longer whether world law is desirable but how world law can be achieved. The problem is extremely difficult and the answers will not be found immediately, or probably in our generation, but certainly we should start seeking for the answers in a more determined way and there are some forward steps than can be achieved immediately:

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.,
New York City, April 28, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a speech delivered by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, April 13, before the Academy of Political Science, together with a letter of comment and congratulations which we have written to Mr. NIXON.

We feel that this is a really historic address which at last brings to sharp focus the central issue of this time. The question is no longer whether world law is desirable but how world law can be achieved.

Although President Eisenhower and other prominent members of both political parties have many times called for world law, Mr. NIXON's speech is the first time that a high official of our Government has proposed specific action leading toward the rule of law. Since it was reportedly proposed as a trial balloon, it seems to us most important that Mr. NIXON receive as much reaction as possible to his proposals.

Whether or not this highly desirable public debate takes place may well depend on a few individuals like yourself who have the influence and interest to lead it. I hope you will do so, and will be interested in hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD HARRINGTON,
President.

The text of Vice President NIXON's address proposing World Court rule in East-West disputes follows:

TEXT OF NIXON'S ADDRESS PROPOSING WORLD COURT RULE IN EAST-WEST DISPUTES

An invitation to address this distinguished audience is one of the most flattering and challenging a man in my position could receive.

Flattering because the very name of this organization at least implies that the profession which I am proud to represent can properly be described as a science rather than by some of the far less complimentary terms usually reserved for politics and politicians.

And challenging because I realize that an academy of political science expects a speech of academic character. I hasten to add, however, if it is proper to quote a Princeton man at a Columbia gathering, that in using the term "academic" I share Woodrow Wilson's disapproval of the usual connotation attached to that word.

Speaking on December 28, 1918, in London's Guildhall, he said:

"When this war began, a league of nations was thought of as one of those things that it was right to characterize by a name which, as a university man, I have always resented. It was said to be academic, as if that in itself were a condemnation, something that men could think about but never get."

In my view, the primary function of the practicing politician and of the political scientist is to find ways and means for people to get those things they think about; to make the impractical practical; to put idealism into action.

It is in that spirit that I ask you to analyze with me tonight the most difficult problem confronting our society today. It is, as I am sure we will all agree, the simple but overriding question of the survival of our civilization. Because, while none of us would downgrade the importance of such challenging problems as the control of inflation, economic growth, civil rights, urban redevelopment, we all know that the most perfect solutions of any of our domestic problems will make no difference at all if we are not around to enjoy them.

CHALLENGE TO SURVIVAL

Perhaps at no time in the course of history have so many people been so sorely troubled by the times and dismayed by the prospects of the future. The almost unbelievably destructive power of modern weapons should be enough to raise grave doubts as to mankind's ability to survive even were we living in a world in which traditional patterns of international conduct were being followed by the major nations.

But the threat to our survival is frighteningly multiplied when we take into account the fact that these weapons are in the hands of the unpredictable leaders of the Communist world as well as those of the free world.

What is the way out of this 20th century human dilemma? For the immediate threat posed by the provocative Soviet tactics in Berlin, I believe that to avoid the ultimate disaster of atomic war on one hand, or the slow death of surrender on the other, we must continue steadfastly on the course now pursued by the President and the Secretary of State.

May I say that before boarding the plane in Washington, I talked at the hospital with the Secretary of State. I am happy to bring the greetings of one of the most heroic and bravest men produced in our country in this generation.

In the record of American policy, as it has unfolded since the time of Korea, our national resolves to stand firm against Communist aggression are clearly revealed. This has particularly been the case since the policy of containment matured into this policy of deterrence. In the recurrent post-Korean crises of the Formosa Straits, the Middle East, and now Berlin, the President and Mr. Dulles have given the Soviet leaders no possible cause to misconstrue the American intent.

I believe, moreover, that the Soviet leaders are equally on notice that regardless of which political party holds power in Washington these policies of resolute adherence to our principles, our commitments and our obligations will prevail. I specifically want to pay tribute to members of the Democratic Party in the Congress for putting statesmanship above leadership by making this clearly evident in the developing situation of Berlin.

ADEQUATE MILITARY POWER

We can also take confidence in the fact that at this moment the United States possesses military power fully adequate to sustain its policies, and I am certain that whatever is necessary to keep this balance in favor of the free nations and the ideals of freedom will be done, by this administration and by its successors regardless of which political party may be in power.

What this posture of resolute national unity taken alone must mean in the end, however, is simply an indefinite preservation of the balance of terror.

We all recognize that this is not enough. Even though our dedication to strength will reduce sharply the chances of war by deliberate overt act, as long as the rule of force retains its paramount position as the final arbiter of international disputes, there will ever remain the possibility of war by miscalculation.

If this sword of annihilation is ever to be removed from its precarious balance over the head of all mankind, some more positive courses of action than massive military deterrence must somehow be found.

It is an understandable temptation for public men to suggest that some "bold new program" will resolve the human dilemma—that more missiles, more aid, more trade, more exchange or more meetings at the summit will magically solve the world's difficulties.

The proposals that I will suggest tonight are not offered as a panacea for the world's ills. In fact, the practice of suggesting that any one program, whatever its merit, can automatically solve the world's problems is not only unrealistic, but, considering the kind of opponent who faces us across the world today, actually can do more harm than good in that it tends to minimize the scope and gravity of the problems with which we are confronted, by suggesting that there may be one easy answer.

But while there is no simple solution for the problems we face, we must constantly search for new practical alternatives to the use of force as a means of settling disputes between nations.

INDIVIDUALS LIKE NATIONS

Men face essentially similar problems of disagreement and resort to force in their personal and community lives as nations now do in the divided world. And, historically, man has found only one effective way to cope with this aspect of human nature—the rule of law.

More and more the leaders of the West have come to the conclusion that the rule of law must somehow be established to provide a way of settling disputes among nations as it does among individuals.

But the trouble has been that as yet we have been unable to find practical methods of implementing this idea. Is this one of those things that men can think about but cannot get?

Let us see what a man who had one of the most brilliant political and legal minds in the Nation's history had to say in this regard. Commenting on some of the problems of international organization the late Senator Robert Taft said:

"I do not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world except by establishing law between nations and equal justice under law. It may be a long hard course, but I believe that the public opinion of the world can be led along that course, so that the time will come when that public opinion will support the decision of any reasonable impartial tribunal based on justice."

We can also be encouraged by developments that have occurred in this field in just the past 2 years.

Not surprisingly the movement to advance the rule of law has gained most of its momentum among lawyers. Mr. Charles Rhyne, a recent president of the American Bar Association, declared in a speech to a group of associates in Boston a few weeks ago that there is an idea on the march in the world. He was referring to the idea that ultimately the rule of law must replace the balance of terror as the paramount factor in the affairs of men.

NOTED MEN SPOKE

At the time of the grand meeting of the American Bar Association in London in July 1957, speaker after speaker at this meeting—the Chief Justice of the United States, the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, the Attorney General of the United States, and Sir Winston Churchill—eloquently testified that the law must be made paramount in world affairs.

One hundred and eighty-five representatives of the legal professions of many nations on earth met in New Delhi last January and agreed that there are basic universal principles on which lawyers of the free world can agree.

President Eisenhower, you will recall, said in his state of the Union message last January:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years * * * to the end that the rule of law may replace the obsolete rule of force in the affairs of nations. Measures toward this end will be proposed later, including reexamination of our relation to the International Court of Justice."

I am now convinced, and in this I reflect the steadfast purpose of the President and the wholehearted support of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, that the time has now come to take the initiative in the right direction of establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force.

Under the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, institutions for the peaceful composing of differences among nations and for law giving exist in the international community. Our primary problem today is not the creation of new international institutions, but the fuller and more fruitful use of the institutions we already possess.

The International Court of Justice is a case in point. Its relative lack of judicial business—in its 12-year history an average of only 2 cases a year have come before the tribunal of 15 outstanding international jurists—underlines the untried potentialities of this Court.

While it would be foolish to suppose that litigation before the Court is the answer to all the world's problems, this method of settling disputes could profitably be employed in a wider range of cases than is presently done.

As the President indicated in his state of the Union message, it is time for the United States to reexamine its own position with regard to the Court. Clearly all disputes regarding domestic matters must remain permanently within the jurisdiction of our own courts. Only matters which are essentially international in character should be referred to the International Court.

But the United States reserved the right to determine unilaterally whether the subject matter of a particular dispute is within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States and is therefore excluded from the jurisdiction of the Court. As a result of this position on our part, other nations have adopted similar reservations. This is one of the major reasons for the lack of judicial business before the Court.

CONGRESS ACTION PLANNED

To remedy this situation the administration will shortly submit to the Congress recommendations for modifying this reservation. It is our hope that by our taking the initiative in this way, other countries may be persuaded to accept and agree to a wider jurisdiction of the International Court.

There is one class of disputes between nations which, in the past, have been one of the primary causes of war. These economic disputes assume major importance today at a time when this cold war may be shifting its major front from politics and ideology to the so-called ruble war for the trade and the development of new and neutral countries.

As far as international trade is concerned, an imposing structure of international agreements already exists. More complex and urgent than trade, as such, is the area of international investment. For in this area will be determined one of the most burning issues of our times—whether the economic development of new nations, so essential to their growth in political self-confidence and successful self-government, will be accomplished peacefully or violently, swiftly or wastefully, in freedom or in regimentation and terror.

We must begin by recognizing that the task of providing the necessary capital for investment in underdeveloped countries is a job too big for mere Government money. Only private money, privately managed, can do it right in many sectors of needed development. And private investment requires a sound and reliable framework of laws in which to work.

Economic development, involving as it does so many lawyers and so many private investors, will tend to spread and promote more civilized legal systems wherever it goes.

Already, in its effort to encourage U.S. private investment abroad, the U.S. Government has negotiated treaties of commerce with 17 nations since 1946, tax conventions with 21 nations, and special-investment guarantee agreements under the Mutual Security Act with 40 nations.

What has been done is for the most part good, but there are several areas where additional action is called for. The countries that need economic development most are too often least likely to have the kind of laws, government, and climate that will attract investment. The political risks of expropriation and inconvertibility against which ICA (International Cooperation Administration) presently sells insurance are not the only political risks that investors fear. Three U.S. Government commissions, as well as numerous private experts, have recently recommended a variety of improvements in our machinery for fostering foreign investment.

I select three for particular endorsement. Our laws should permit the establishment of foreign business corporations meriting special tax treatment, so that their foreign earnings can be reinvested abroad free of U.S. tax until the U.S. investor actually receives his reward.

In addition, more tax treaties should be speedily negotiated to permit tax sparing and other reciprocal encouragements to investors. The ICA guarantee program should be extended to include such risks as revolution and civil strife. Finally, a concerted effort should be made to extend our whole treaty system into more countries, especially those in most need of development.

The great adventure of economic development through a worldwide expansion of private investment is bound to develop many new forms and channels of cooperation between governments and between individuals of different nations.

We need not fear this adventure; indeed we should welcome it. For if it sufficiently engages the imagination and public spirit of the legal profession and others who influence public opinion, it must be accompanied by the discovery or rediscovery, in countries old and new, of the legal principles and the respect for substantive law on which wealth and freedom alike are grounded.

There are encouraging signs at least that we are on the threshold of real progress toward creating more effective international law for the settlement of economic disputes between individuals and between nations.

Turning to the political area, we have now come far enough along in the great historic conflict between the free nations and the Communist bloc to know that negotiation and discussion alone will not necessarily resolve the fundamental issues between us. This has proved to be the case whether the negotiations took place through the very helpful processes of the United Nations, or at the conference table of Foreign Ministers, or even at what we now call the summit.

PACTS WITH SOVIET CITED

What emerges, eventually, from these meetings at the conference table are agreements. We have made a great many agreements with the Soviet leaders from the time

of Yalta and Potsdam. A major missing element in our agreements with the Soviet leaders has been any provisions as to how disputes about the meaning of the agreements in connection with their implementation could be decided.

Looking back at the first summit conference at Geneva, for example, we find that it produced an agreement, signed by the Soviet leaders, which elevated the hopes of the entire world.

It should be noted, however, that the President and the Secretary of State repeatedly warned both before and after the holding of the conference that success could be measured only in deeds. One of the announced purposes of the conference was to test the Soviet sincerity by the standard of performance.

The summit conference has since been characterized by some as a failure, but in terms of agreements, as such, it was a success.

Let me quote briefly from that agreement:

"The heads of government, recognizing their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security."

In other words, those who participated in the conference, including Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, agreed at Geneva on a sound method for dealing with the German problem—the very same problem from which he has now fathered the new crisis at Berlin. But while the agreement seemed clear, as events subsequently developed, Mr. Khrushchev's understanding of its meaning was ostensibly different from ours.

The crucial question remained—how was the agreement to be effective when the parties disagreed as to what it meant? This is typical of a problem that can arise wherever any agreement is entered into between nations.

In looking to the future what practical steps can we take to meet this problem? I will not even suggest to you that there is any simple answer to this question. But I do believe there is a significant step we can take toward finding an answer.

We should take the initiative in urging that in future agreements provisions be included to the effect: (1) that disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the Hague; and (2) that the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the decision of the court in such cases.

Such provisions will, of course, still leave us with many formidable questions involving our relationships with the Communist nations in those cases where they ignore an agreement completely apart from its interpretation. But I believe this would be a major step forward in developing a rule of law for the settlement of political disputes between nations and in the direction all free men hope to pursue.

If there is no provision for settling disputes as to what an international agreement means and one nation is acting in bad faith, the agreement has relatively little significance. In the absence of such a provision an agreement can be flagrantly nullified by a nation acting in bad faith whenever it determines it is convenient to do so.

While this proposal has not yet been adopted as the official U.S. position, I have discussed it at length with Attorney General William P. Rogers and with officials of the State Department and on the basis of these discussions I am convinced that it has merit and should be given serious consideration in the future.

The International Court of Justice is not a Western instrumentality. It is a duly constituted body under the United Nations Charter and has been recognized and established by the Soviet along with the other signatories to the charter.

There is no valid reason why the Soviets should not be willing to join with the nations of the free world in taking this step in the direction of submitting differences with regard to interpretation of agreements between nations to a duly established international court and thereby further the day when a rule of law will become a reality in the relations between nations.

And, on our part, as Secretary Dulles said in his speech before the New York State Bar Association on January 31:

"Those nations which do have common standards should by their conduct and example, advance the rule of law by submitting their disputes to the International Court of Justice, or to some other international tribunal upon which they agree."

We should be prepared to show the world by our example that the rule of law, even in the most trying circumstances, is the one system which all freemen of good will must support.

In this connection it should be noted that at the present time in our own country our system of law and justice has come under special scrutiny, as it often has before in periods when we have been engaged in working out basic social relationships through due process of law.

It is certainly proper for any of us to disagree with an opinion of a court or courts. But all Americans owe it to the most fundamental propositions of our way of life to take the greatest care in making certain that our criticisms of court decisions do not become attacks on the institution of the court itself.

Mr. Khrushchev has proclaimed time and again that he and his associates in the Kremlin, to say nothing of the Soviet peoples, desire only a fair competition to test which system, communism or free capitalism, can better meet the legitimate aspirations of mankind for a rising standard of living.

The world knows that this is the only kind of competition which the free nations desire. It is axiomatic that free people do not go to war except in defense of freedom. So obviously we welcome this kind of talk from Mr. Khrushchev. We welcome a peaceful competition with the Communists to determine who can do the most for mankind.

Mr. Khrushchev also knows, as we do, that a competition is not likely to remain peaceful unless both sides understand the rules and are willing to have them fairly enforced by an impartial umpire. He has pointedly reminded the world that Soviet troops are not in Germany to play skittles. The free peoples passionately wish that Mr. Khrushchev's troops, as well as their own, could find it possible to play more skittles and less atomic war games. But we remind him that his troops could not even play skittles without rules of the game.

If the Soviets mean this talk of peaceful competition, then they have nothing to fear from the impartial rules impartially judged, which will make such peaceful competition possible.

The Soviet leaders claim to be acutely aware of the lessons of history. They are constantly quoting the past to prove their contention that communism is the way of the future. May I call to their attention one striking conclusion that is found in every page of recorded history.

It is this: The advance of civilization, the growth of culture and the perfection of all the finest qualities of mankind have all been accompanied by respect for law and justice and by the constant growth of the use of law in place of force.

The barbarian, the outlaw, the bandit are symbols of a civilization that is either primitive or decadent. As men grow in wisdom, they recognize that might does not make right; that true liberty is freedom under law; and that the arrogance of power is a pitiful substitute for justice and equity.

Hence once again we say to those in the Kremlin who boast of the superiority of their system:

"Let us compete in peace, and let our course of action be such that the choice we offer uncommitted peoples is not a choice between progress and reaction, between high civilization and a return to barbarism, between the rule of law and the rule of force."

In a context of justice, of concern for the millions of men and women who yearn for peace, of a constant striving to bring the wealth abounding in this earth to those who today languish in hunger and want—in such a context, competition between the Communist world and the free world would indeed be meaningful.

Then we could say without hesitation:

"Let the stronger system win, knowing that both systems would be moving in a direction of a world of peace, with increasing material prosperity serving as a foundation for a flowering of the human spirit."

We could then put aside the hatred and distrust of the past and work for a better world. Our goal will be peace. Our instrument for achieving peace will be law and and justice. Our hope will be that, under these conditions, the vast energies now devoted to weapons of war will instead be used to clothe, house, and feed the entire world. This is the only goal worthy of our aspirations. Competing in this way, nobody will lose, and mankind will gain.

I also want to include an article by James Reston, "Search for Rule by Law," which appeared in the New York Times, April 14, 1959:

SEARCH FOR RULE BY LAW—DOMESTIC FACTORS AS WELL AS WORLD ISSUES LED TO TRIAL BALLOON BY NIXON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Vice President NIXON sent aloft in New York tonight a fairly important trial balloon on how to negotiate future agreements with the Soviet Union.

Why not, he suggested to the Academy of Political Science, let the International Court of Justice at The Hague settle all differences of interpretation of future United States-Soviet agreements? The background of this suggestion is as interesting as the proposal itself.

It arises from the fact that almost every United States-Soviet agreement since the war has failed wholly or in part because it was interpreted in one way by Washington and another by Moscow, and there was no legal way of resolving these differences.

Accordingly, the Justice and State Departments have been talking for years about trying to take these questions of interpretation out of the political sphere and placing them in the realm of international law before the World Court or some other court.

Attorney General William P. Rogers and Arthur Larson, former Presidential assistant, have been talking with Mr. NIXON about this for several years. The Vice President, in turn, recently discussed the proposal with Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, and with the President, who knew and approved of the Vice President's decision to discuss the matter publicly tonight.

FUTURE IS EMPHASIZED

It was emphasized here today that the Vice President was not talking about trying to apply the principle of compulsory arbitration to the interpretation of past treaties and international agreements.

He was, instead, proposing a procedure for future agreements so that each agreement

could be considered on its own merits. For example, if the forthcoming talks with the Big Four foreign ministers should reach a new agreement on Berlin, or Germany, or atomic testing, that agreement, under the Nixon proposal, would contain a clause stating two things:

1. That any disputes that may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the World Court.

2. That the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the interpretation of the World Court in such cases.

The proposal was put forward in this way for several reasons. For example, there is still considerable opposition on the Republican right and in the Democratic South to any move that might, even in remote cases, extend the authority of the World Court to matters some people regard as wholly within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

The administration would like to repeal the so-called Connally amendment of 1946, which insisted that the United States had the sole right to determine whether cases involving the United States should be subject to the jurisdiction of the World Court.

In the last few years, the administration has with difficulty defeated the so-called Bricker amendment, which would have placed further limitations on the jurisdiction of the United Nations and its associated organizations. And while the supporters of the Bricker amendment have been weakened in recent elections, the State and Justice Departments do not want to get involved in another battle on this issue.

Before the end of this week, the State Department will send to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee its ideas of how the Connally amendment should be modified, but there is some doubt whether any modification will take place in this session of the Congress.

The administration is more hopeful about winning acceptance for the more specific idea of letting the World Court decide disputes arising out of the interpretation of future agreements with the Soviet Union and other nations.

This would enable the Congress to look at one case at a time. It would force the Executive to draft future international agreements in careful language that could, if challenged, be examined by the World Court, rather than leaving them vague, as in the past Big Four agreements on Western access to Berlin. Finally, it would, if accepted by the Soviet Union, provide one way of resolving the interminable arguments over what United States-Soviet agreements mean.

It is pointed out here that, even if the Soviet Union did not agree to submit the interpretaton of future agreements to the World Court this in itself would make clear Moscow's insistence on being the sole judge of its own actions. Whereas, if it did accept, at least some progress could be made toward substituting the rule of law in a limited field for the present rule of force.

There will undoubtedly be opposition to Mr. NIXON'S trial balloon. Some Senators feel that the United States, like the Soviet Union, cannot afford to let any court decide matters that might affect its security.

Some for example, would be opposed to letting the World Court sit in judgment on Panama's claim to sovereignty over the 12-mile sea limit beyond its shores. This would take in most of the critical approaches to the Panama Canal and is thus regarded here as vital to the security of the canal and the United States.

Finally, there are some legislators who think that any extension of the powers of the World Court might, at some future date, enable citizens of the United States to claim that they were not enjoying the human rights spelled out in the Declaration of Human Rights under the United Nations.

Thus, Vice President NIXON, in his scholarly address tonight, has opened up, not only some fundamental legal questions, but quite a few important international and national political questions as well.

This is why his World Court idea was put forward as a trial balloon rather than as established administration policy.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, standing in the living present, as its panorama unfolds, teach us to be taught by the speaking past.

Make us greatly humble as we have a part in determining the directions and goals of today.

May we be still long enough to listen to the sad story of cultures which have failed in their high hour and have left only broken memories of great races displaced by less creative races, of civilizations which have been undone or have undone themselves just as they seemed ready to enter into their glory.

Solemnize us with the knowledge that the divine laws—which, defied across the ages, have brought collapse, decline, and defeat—have not been revoked in Thy world, and that still where there is no vision the people perish.

May this glittering century, so rich in things and so poor in soul, by its clamor not drown Thy voice, warning—

"I have set before you life and death—therefore choose life."

We ask it in the Name of the Holy One who came to bring life abundant to all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 12, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 2193) to designate the Coyote Valley Reservoir in California as Lake Mendocino, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 2193) to designate the Coyote Valley Reservoir in California as Lake Mendocino, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, were authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session, to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John M. Raymond, of the District of Columbia, to be a representative on the United Nations Commission on Permanent Sovereignty Over Natural Wealth and Resources, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Stuart Rothman, of Minnesota, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board;

Dr. Logan Wilson, of Texas, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation;

Thomas Edward Keys, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service; and

Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Clarence R. Reed, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations: